THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIII OCTOBER, 1926 No. 76

EDITORIAL

REUNION

We publish this month the second of Professor Turner's articles on St. Peter; and together with the earlier one which appeared in August, and with other items in the current issue, it suggests some considerations of the subject of Reunion. Despite temporary checks in this direction or in that, the movement grows apace. So far as concerns home reunion, its official documents are conveniently brought together in a little volume entitled *The Church of England and the Free Churches*,* edited by the Dean of Canterbury and the Rev. W. L. Robertson. From time to time, moreover, this Journal has published or referred to documents bearing on the progress of understanding between our own Communion on the one hand, and the Orthodox Church of the East (and the Old Catholics) on the other. No official account has yet been given of the work done in the Malines conversations; but there are rumours that this will not be delayed; and meanwhile Lord Halifax's two pamphlets, *Reunion and the Roman Primacy* and *Catholic Reunion*,† represent at least one important line of advance which is being there explored. More important, however, than any results so far registered or foreshadowed, is the temper which is being steadily generated, both here and on the Continent, in connection with the cause. If we were to describe it as large-heartedness, we might be accused of forgetting that which is its source—namely, the growing conviction that the one, all-sufficient Christ cannot be truly or adequately served by anything less than one Church. The root of this movement, in short, is not, as the Dean of St. Paul's has so often said, the lust of spiritual empire and domination: it is no less a thing than a fresh unveiling of the mystery of God's will in the Person of the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ. It is because Christ is standing out in fresh

* Oxford University Press. 1925. 2s. net.

† Published by Messrs. Mowbray in 1925 and 1926 respectively.

splendour of power and character against the background of our generation and its weaknesses that believers in Him find many of the conventional barriers that divide them petty and unmeaning. The great division in human society is that which separates believing Christians from the world; and, with the issue so ranged, it becomes more and more overwhelmingly plain that the "one Body," no less than the "one Spirit," is involved in the confession of the "one Lord" and the "one God and Father of all." To have this faith and hope is to be a Catholic.

It is an axiom that every new movement of the Spirit of God involves a fresh discovery of the meaning of Scripture, and not least of the prophets. It was so with the revivals which sprang from St. Benedict, St. Bernard, St. Francis; with the main streams of the Reformation movement; with the work of Penn and Fox and Wesley; with the Oxford Movement and the work of Kingsley and the Christian Socialists. It is so, too, and abundantly, with the cause of Reunion. Let anyone read the prophets with the thought of the reunited Church as the key to all their promises of the restoration of Zion, and see whether his heart does not burn within him. Over and over again he will hear the living Christ expounding to him out of the Scriptures that "thus it must be." And as he learns their lesson, he will find himself looking with new eyes at the great concrete elements of the problem which history presents to him—at Rome, Constantinople, Canterbury; at Jordan's Meeting House and the City Temple; at the Quirinal, the Capitol at Washington, the Houses of Parliament. Where do these things stand in the divine counsel?

None of the prophets speaks more plainly to our condition than Zechariah; and his prophecy is the more significant since so much of it has been already "baptized into Christ" by the author of the Apocalypse. Like ourselves, he is concerned with the restoration of visible unity in the Church's institutional life. His cause, like ours, was beset by complicated problems of politics. For him, as for us, there was a "spiritualty" in the Church which needed to be vindicated; and it was the more difficult to do it because its obvious representative, the high-priest, was compromised in the eyes of many by the fact that he had remained, throughout the days of dispersion, in the city of Jerusalem. It may be well to dwell for a moment upon some of the outstanding features of his visions and utterances.

There is first the main promise of a restored Church which rings loud and insistent through the first eight chapters.

> Sing and rejoice, O daughters of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall inherit Judah as his portion in the holy land, and shall yet choose Jerusalem (ii. 10-12).

And immediately there follows the command to remember that the real Agent in the movement is God, not man:

> Be silent, all flesh, before the Lord; for he is waked up out of his holy habitation (ii. 13)—

words which have found an echo in the hymnody of the Eucharist as a confession of the majesty of God's Presence.

Yet man, too, has his part to play. There is need of the stout hearts of pioneers, who are not daunted by "the day of small things" (iv. 10). Through all adversity of men and circumstance, which tempts us to impatient methods, the motto of the movement must be held fast:

> Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts (iv. 6).

For, indeed, no obstacles are insurmountable, no prejudices too great to be allayed:

> Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain; and he shall bring forth the headstone with shoutings of Grace, grace, unto it (iv. 7).

But there is more than prejudice to be removed: there is the sin which was once its abundant justification. If men come to recognize the claims of the one Catholic Church, it is because they cannot but see there the convincing "notes" of truth and holiness:

> Jerusalem shall be called the city of truth; and the mountain of the Lord of hosts the holy mountain (viii. 3).

But that consummation will carry with it the solution of many other problems. We shall not need to lament then that the Church fails to appeal to youth, for:

> The streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof (viii. 5).

The old insularities born of nationalism will be dissolved in the larger loyalty of a Catholic fellowship:

> And many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people (ii. 11). . . . Behold, I will save my people from the east country, and from the west country (viii. 7).

And, finally, out of this restored Church will go forth again the social and moral witness which has been so often forgotten:

Thus hath the Lord of hosts spoken, saying, Execute true judgment, and show mercy and compassion every man to his brother: and oppress not the widow, nor the fatherless, the stranger, nor the poor; and let none of you imagine evil against his brothers in your heart (vii. 9, 10).

But the promised restoration is not a formless thing; it is connected with particular offices and persons. Two visions are of especial interest here. The first is that recorded in Zech. iii. 1-8.* The prophet sees Joshua, the high-priest, "clothed with filthy garments" as on trial before the Lord, and under accusation by a "satan" or angel of criticism divinely appointed to this task. The purport of the vision is to instruct the prophet that the days of the trial are over. There is a limit to the function of criticism, and it has now done its work. Joshua is "a brand plucked out of the fire" (iii. 2), and his rehabilitation is symbolized by the abandonment of the filthy garments and the substitution of "rich apparel" and "a fair mitre." Yet it is not to be supposed that the restoration of the High Priesthood is without limits or conditions. The angel of criticism was a messenger of God, bearing His commission; and the permanent value of his work is seen in the terms of the re-investiture. The divine recognition of Joshua's High Priesthood is to be contingent, that is to say, on the righteousness of his conduct; and the sphere of his action is to be clearly defined.

Thus said the Lord of hosts: If thou wilt walk in my ways, and if thou wilt keep my charge, then thou also shalt judge my house, and shalt also keep my courts, and I will give thee places to walk in among these that stand by.

To this condition may be added a further one implied in an earlier vision (ii. 1-5), where a man with a measuring line in his hand is bidden to desist from his survey. For the new Jerusalem is not to be fortified: but—

I, the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and I will be the glory in the midst of her.

The application of the principles enshrined in these visions to the tasks of Reunion is fairly clear. Whatever else we may say of the Papacy, it cannot be questioned that it has represented with unique consistency and force the divinely com-

* Here and throughout I am following Professor Kennett's exegesis of the prophecy in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible.*

missioned independence of the Christian spiritualty. But this necessary function in the life of the Church was distorted by a succession of Popes in the medieval period into a claim to universal and temporal domination. To withstand that claim Protestantism was sent as God's accusing angel; and for nearly four centuries the Papacy has stood at the bar of Christian conscience. Yet it is not God's will that the trial should have no ending. In response to criticism the Roman Church has already gone far to reform itself: and personal integrity and holiness are qualities required now of a Pope. Not that all is done, however. The present writer recently witnessed a beatification ceremony in St. Peter's at Rome. The skilful illuminations of the sanctuary, the fanfare of trumpets, the enthusiastic devotion of the crowd, the simple and unassuming demeanour of the supreme Pontiff himself—all these left a lasting impression on his mind. But there was one feature of the ceremony which must surely be changed: it is the fixed bayonets of the Papal Guards, who line the route of the procession up the nave. They are symbolic, no doubt; but they are symbolic of what is antiquated. They symbolize, though with even more sinister suggestion, what the measuring line symbolized in Zechariah's vision—a reliance upon earthly weapons for the defence of the city of God. We may safely say that, before the Papal primacy can be recognized, those bayonets must be taken out of St. Peter's.

Once more, there is still much to be done in the way of defining the relative positions and functions of the Papacy and the Episcopate. This is, in effect, the burden of Dr. Kidd's review of Mgr. Batiffol's *Catholicisme et Papauté*, which we publish this month. A primacy is not easy to define; but the analogy of a college and its Head is probably as helpful as any. Once it is granted that both papacy and episcopate represent developments of elements in the Church which fell and fall within our Lord's design—and Professor Turner's articles would seem to mean no less—then it should not be too hard a thing for us, with the assistance of God's grace, to give positive and constitutional form to their relation. The criticisms of papal domination which have marked Protestantism in history have been accompanied, especially in those countries where Protestantism has been strongest, by a vast number of fruitful experiments in the art of government; and the experience so gained will be invaluable when the hour comes—as it may well come soon—for beginning the actual work of rebuilding the holy city.

The vision of Joshua's rehabilitation is followed immediately in Zechariah by another (iv. 1-6*b*, 10*b*, 11, 13, 14) not less important, whether regard be had to its subject or to the use made of it in the pages of the New Testament (Rev. iv. 5, xi.). It is a vision of a seven-branched golden lamp-stand, with its bowl fed with oil from two olive-trees, one on either side. In the interpretation we are to understand that the seven lamps represent the intensity of the divine light shining in the Church (*cf.* Matt. v. 14-16); while the two olive-trees represent Joshua and Zerubbabel, the two channels of divine authority and grace. In the vision of the seer of Patmos, these two olive-trees become "two witnesses" (Rev. xi. 4); and Professor Turner makes the illuminating suggestion that what the author has in mind is the two martyrs, St. Peter and St. Paul. Such a representation would be quite in harmony with apocalyptic methods, from Zechariah onwards; and, if it maintain itself, we should have yet a further piece of evidence for the view of the early Church as to the twin foundations of Christian institutionalism. Yet we need not suppose that this is the only use which Christian prophecy can make of Zechariah's vision; and, in fact, fidelity to Antiochene principles of exegesis—which insist on the historical reference first, and only afterwards proceed to more general lessons—suggests that it has another message as well. For, throughout Zechariah's prophecy, Joshua and Zerubbabel stand respectively for the ecclesiastical and the civil power, for Church and State. One of the prophet's great aims was, indeed, to reconcile these two forms of authority, each divine in origin and yet distinct in function; and his task, it would seem, was the more difficult owing to the existence of some personal friction between the two leaders. It is this line of interpretation which we will endeavour to develop here.

The relations of Church and State are not often brought into court in connection with the Reunion issue; though an important exception is to be found in "A Short Memorandum on the Problems connected with the Union between Church and State," adopted by one of the Lambeth "Joint Conferences" held on June 19, 1925 (*The Church of England and the Free Churches*, p. 84). That document is important at once for its moderation and for its synthetic aim. From the Nonconformist standpoint the main principle is laid down that "the Church should enjoy complete autonomy in the discharge of all its spiritual functions"; and it may be safely said that that is a principle which would undoubtedly be endorsed by the Papacy —as all recent experience shows—as a condition of Catholic

Reunion. But principles have to be applied; and the application of principles by great corporate bodies involves negotiation and arrangement with the State. Thus, it is effectively pointed out from the Anglican side that "Establishment" is a term of varying meaning, inasmuch as the nature of the link which binds Church and State in England has, in fact, been greatly modified in recent years; while it also differs in different parts of the British Commonwealth. What has to be determined, in short, in regard to the Church's claim to "complete autonomy," is not whether or not the Church shall have legislative recognition—the "Free Churches" have that no less than the Church of England—but how far it shall extend. The question, in short, is one of degree. On that matter there is obviously room for different policies in different circumstances. Whether we speak of the link between Church and State as a Concordat, or as Establishment, or as part of the law of Corporations, does not make much difference; wherever the State is not actively hostile to the Church, some measure of "Establishment" there has got to be.

One thing, however, is too easily forgotten—namely, the interest of the State: and it may be taken as certain that, so soon as the Reunion movement approaches the stage of action, the attention of statesmen and diplomatists will be keenly concentrated upon it. It is impossible to predict, of course, what their attitude will be upon issues which are not yet practical politics; but it may safely be surmised that what governments will look to first is the positive welfare of the nations they represent. Broadly speaking, it may be said that it is to the interest of governments that organized religion should be strong, but not too strong—strong, because stable centres of cohesion are the best antidote to the disintegrating tendencies found in every State; not too strong, because the State can never run the risk of having its own authority superseded by that of any of its constituent elements. This means that what statesmen aim at is not the application of a theory, but the achievement of a practical balance between the spiritual and temporal power which shall serve the ends of both. The strength of Italy, Germany, and England in Europe to-day is largely a result of the accomplishment of this aim; the weakness of France is not a little concerned with the failure to accomplish it; while thoughtful Americans say that the solution of this problem is now, in view of the rapid growth of Roman Catholicism in the United States, one of the most urgent and delicate tasks confronting their country.

Facts such as these are not only likely to deter governments from the kind of arid and negative policy as regards Church and State which characterized the Radicalism of an earlier generation: they will also play a vital part in the actual working-out of ecclesiastical unity. It is no use supposing that a religious movement of this magnitude can be divorced from politics; and the Church may be sure that one of the most important factors to be reckoned with is the constructive realism of national governments. The Scriptural and Catholic principle of the divine commission of the State within its own sphere should operate to pave the way for a fruitful partnership between Church and State as one of the coefficients of Reunion. At the risk of paradox, we will venture to say that the Church of England's close link with the State, so far from being an obstacle to Reunion with the Holy See, is one of the factors in the situation which in many ways facilitates it; and the corollary of the recognition of the Papal primacy by the English Church will be the recognition of the Act of Supremacy by the Pope.

The defence of this statement involves considerations at once political and theological. The former turn upon the value which statesmen commonly set upon the cultivation of affinities between disciplined bodies of loyal and public-spirited citizens in different countries. Such bonds act as supports and instruments of international peace, understanding, and good-will, and have an intimate connection with a country's prestige abroad. Just as the Anglican Communion to-day is one of the great cements of the British Commonwealth of Nations, so Reunion should promote a still more widely felt solidarity, which would be an asset of great value in the conduct of foreign relations. But the State's association with the movement has theological bearings as well. It is not simply that this partnership would provide the best guarantee for the preservation of the cherished principles of religious liberty; it would also be the most effective antidote to those subtle forces of Monophysitism which are among the most formidable dangers of institutionalism. By Monophysitism we mean the tendency, frequently seen in Church history, to *substitute* the supernatural for the natural instead of *redeeming* the natural by the work of grace. Examples of it may be seen in the unlimited ecclesiasticism of Calvin no less than of Hildebrand; in the medieval doctrine of Transubstantiation, which denied the reality of the bread in the Eucharist; in the narrower forms alike of Monasticism and of Puritanism; in the cruder and more popular forms of the doctrine of Infallibility. On the whole, both the Anglican

and the Orthodox Churches have successfully withstood this danger; and their reconciliation with the Holy See should go far to redress the balance, where it needs redressing. But it is significant that it is precisely these Churches which have consistently maintained close and affectionate relations with the State. The effect of these relations, in short, is to give its proper weight to the human side of Christianity—to keep the leaven in the lump instead of in a place by itself. It is to remember that the restoration of Zion needs its Zerubbabel no less than its Joshua.

But we need hardly say that it is not considerations of this kind which provide the motive for Reunion. That lies elsewhere, in the growing vision of God's will for His Church. And our great obligation, as the Bishop of Winchester has recently pointed out, is "a deeper response to the leadership of the Spirit."* To be a Catholic is to hold to that vision of unity, in prayer and hope, through good report and ill. It is the division of the Church into its rival camps of Judah and Israel, of Catholic and Protestant, that more than anything else has veiled our witness and weakened our wish. It is through union only that we shall find grace again to bring God's blessing to a needy world.

For there shall be the seed of peace; the vine shall give her fruit, and the ground shall give her increase, and the heavens shall give their dew; and I will cause the remnant of this people to inherit all these things. And it shall come to pass that, as ye were a curse among the nations, O house of Judah and house of Israel, so will I save you and ye shall be a blessing: fear not, but let your hands be strong (Zech. viii. 12, 13).

It may well be that the powers of unbelief and secularism have yet more seeds of strife to sow and more harvests of war and revolution to reap in Christendom: the "peace of the Church" is not won but through tribulation. But as these forces advance, so more and more will the Christ-loving army be impelled to close its ranks, and by its unity and peace save civilization from itself.

Yea, many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to intreat the favour of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts: In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirts of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you (viii. 22, 23).

That is the promise which it is the glorious and humbling privilege of every Catholic to inherit.

* *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1926.

II.—ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In the previous paper we considered, on the basis of all four Gospels, St. Peter's position as leader and spokesman of the Apostles, and on the express testimony of three of them—the fourth being defective at the point where its evidence may well have reinforced theirs—the commission to Peter, by express words of Christ, of a place of unique authority, whether in relation to the other Apostles or to the Christian community as a whole. We have seen further that the book of Acts not merely confirms the impression of Peter's leadership among the original Apostles and in the infant Church, but also, when attentively examined, emphasizes his principal responsibility, under direct Divine guidance, for the throwing open of the doors of the New Israel to uncircumcised outsiders. Peter's work is, in fact, the point of juncture and transition between the first beginnings and their triumphant development, between the Jewish-Christian and the Gentile-Christian mission, between the task confided to the original Apostles and the task confided to St. Paul. If our documents are to be trusted, there is no break between the ministry of Christ and the ministry of Peter and his fellow Apostles, no break between the ministry of Peter and the ministry of Paul; no break, but an ordered development of which the first stage rests on the direct commission of Christ and the second on the direct overruling of His Spirit.

How far, we have now to ask, is the conception thus expressed by the evangelists and the writer of the Acts in harmony with the evidence to be gathered from the letters of St. Paul?

We have to remember, first and foremost, that St. Paul's correspondence, so far as it has come down to us, differs from the general pictures of the work of Christ and of the work of the early Church, such as the Gospels and Acts attempt to give us, by its entirely "occasional" character. It will be less suspect, no doubt, of being written to order: but it must be recognized, at the same time, as making no pretence to completeness, for St. Paul only tells us what is necessary for his immediate purpose, and so far as that purpose is controversial he naturally marshals just those considerations, and those only, which subserve his argument.

In one epistle fortunately his relation to the older Apostles, and to St. Peter in particular, is so central to the exposition of

his thought that he gives us abundantly clear indications both of his actual intercourse, down to the date of the epistle, with St. Peter and the rest, and of the conception which he held of his own position in regard to theirs. The Galatian churches had been founded and organized by him, during his first missionary journey, on the basis of the freedom of Gentile Christians from the ordinances of the Jewish Law: and this policy had had, in fact, the sanction and support of the authorities at Jerusalem. In the historical summary sketched in Gal. i. 18-ii. 14 St. Paul shows, no doubt, a little embarrassment. In theory he would maintain the entire independence of his apostleship from any human control: it rested on a direct divine call, "by revelation from Jesus Christ," at the occasion of his conversion. In practice, however, he felt so strongly the danger of the division of the followers of Christ into two separate camps that he had been twice to Jerusalem—a first private visit, as it were, to St. Peter, and a second more or less official visit, "in accordance with a divine revelation," to put before the heads of the original community the Gospel which he was now preaching among the Gentiles, in order to secure their private sanction and to guard himself against any disowning, then or later on, of his work. His object was attained: the sphere and the content of his preaching were alike ratified. A division of labour was recognized, and hands of fellowship were exchanged. Paul was to be free to preach Christ to the Gentiles without interference or criticism from the mother Church.

St. Paul no doubt understood this concordat to imply that, just as he was not free to tell Jewish Christians that they might cease to observe the Law, so the Church of Jerusalem was not free to tell Gentile Christians that they were bound to observe it. And St. Peter understood it in the same sense; for on visiting the Antiochene Church he entered into full communion with the Gentile Christians there—as, indeed, unless he repudiated his own action in the case of Cornelius, he was bound to do. But a mission from headquarters—"from Judæa," as St. Luke kindly puts it: "from James" in the blunter language of St. Paul—raised the old difficulty, though, perhaps, in a new form. It is possible that Jerusalem Christians accepted the preaching of the Gospel to the uncircumcised Gentiles and the admission of these to Christian baptism, but argued that, even if circumcision and the observance of the Law need not precede baptism, yet they ought to follow it. Anyhow, whatever exact line they took, their mission had much success among both the Galatian converts and the Jewish section of the Church at Antioch. Even Peter, even Barnabas, doubtless in the hope of staving off anything like a schism, made concessions to the Judaizers.

But St. Paul saw that it was a moment not for the making of concessions, but for the clear statement of principles: and he was not afraid to expostulate in public—obviously he is quite conscious what a strong step that was to take—with St. Peter, on the ground that St. Peter's own action and principles had committed him to the Pauline side of the question, and that concession here was only cowardice. As we know, St. Paul's stand justified itself: all the responsible leaders of the Church, James himself included, came round to St. Paul's view.

What, then, do we gather from the Galatian letter of St. Paul's attitude towards the Petrine primacy, and in what way does he correlate his own position to it?

The letter was dashed off in a white heat of indignation against what seemed to its writer a terrible backsliding from the freedom of the Gospel of Christ. Yet even so St. Paul, in the account of the history of his dealings with those who were Apostles before him, fully admits both that he had entered into personal relations with St. Peter, and that he had "referred" his "Gospel" to the leading authorities at Jerusalem. His point is that he and they had found themselves in full agreement, and that in effect they had sanctioned his assertion of Gentile freedom. If we accept St. Luke's story of the case of Cornelius and its sequel at Jerusalem, it is clear that St. Paul was right, and that in principle the question had been settled before St. Paul came to Jerusalem to discuss it. St. Peter had committed himself, however reluctantly at the outset, to the cause of which St. Paul became the champion, and the argument that Peter's backsliding stood self-condemned was unanswerable.

Having, then, so far cleared the ground, we must now try to extract, from this passage in the Galatian letter of St. Paul, what sort of idea of St. Peter's position, and of his own in relation to it, underlies St. Paul's action and language.

In the first place St. Paul went up, on his first journey to Jerusalem, ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν. To translate ἱστορῆσαι "visit" is not in itself adequate; in classical Greek, at least, the word always connotes (see Liddell and Scott) the idea of "inquiring," "learning by inquiry." Chrysostom *ad loc.*, as Lightfoot notes, tells us that it means more than ἰδεῖν, and that it is the word used by those οἱ τὰς μεγάλας πόλεις καὶ λαμπρὰς καταμανθάνοντες: and the parallels quoted in Moulton and Milligan, *s.v.*, from the papyri are all quite similarly of places and things. When you "visit" the British Museum, you go there not to pay a visit of compliment, but to admire and learn. Now St. Paul twice uses in 1 Corinthians the verb παραλαμβάνω (xv. 3, xi. 23) with reference to the Baptismal Creed and the Eucharistic formula—these things, that is to say, he had learnt from those who were

Christians before him. And we need not doubt that he "visited" St. Peter not merely to make his personal acquaintance, but to "inquire of him," to learn what he could: not to be instructed (of course) in the faith of Christ, but to hear all that St. Peter had to tell him about the ministry and teaching of the Master whom both followed.*

Here, then, we have an indirect but unmistakable indication of recognition by St. Paul of Peter's special place among the Apostles. Still more illuminating is the phrase in ii. 8, which at once recognizes St. Peter's special position and brings St. Paul's own claim into relation with it. "They saw that I had been entrusted with the task of preaching the good news to the uncircumcision as Peter to the circumcision. For he that energized in Peter to an apostleship of the circumcision, energized in the same way in me for the Gentiles." What Peter was to the Jewish Christian Church, that Paul was for the Gentile Christian Church; and, conversely, just as the work among the Gentiles could be expressed in the one name of Paul, so the apostleship of the circumcision could be expressed in the one name of Peter. If Peter did not stand alone on the one side, for there were "James and Cephas and John," neither did Paul on the other, for there was Barnabas as well as Paul (ii. 9). But if the plural "we to the Gentiles, they to the circumcision," represented one side of the facts, it was equally true that the singular "Peter" and "Paul" embodied a no less cardinal aspect of the truth. Just as St. Paul "magnified" his own office, so he magnified St. Peter's.

In the only other letter where mention is made of St. Peter, the conception appears to be exactly the same. "He was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve" (1 Cor. xv. 5) is, it would seem, not St. Paul's own phrase, but that of the primitive creed which he is citing;† but both the collocation and the order put St. Paul's theory of the original organization of the Church in a nutshell. "Theory" and "organization" are, of course, too formal terms; what is meant to be suggested is that in St. Paul's idea of the Christian community in its earliest stage Peter had a place and the Twelve (or the Apostles) had a place, but that to the eyes of St. Paul Peter loomed the larger.

Three times in the rest of 1 Corinthians is the name of Cephas mentioned—i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5. In the last passage, "the other apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas," we have, as it seems, an ascending scale culminating in a single name:

* I must express my obligation to Dr. Lock for pointing out to me the full significance of ἱστορῆσαι.

† Note that the clauses of what we may call this primitive "creed" are all introduced by ὅτι: from the beginning of verse 6 they are reinforced by St. Paul with a historical statement of other Resurrection appearances.

James lies *perdu*, so to say, in the group to which he belongs, but Peter had to be distinguished from the group of "the Apostles." In both of the other passages we have the three names Paul, Apollos, Cephas,* but iii. 4-6 suggests that what St. Paul had directly in view was a rivalry between his own name and that of Apollos; there is nothing definitely said about a Cephas party, and I think that Peter's name is thrown in as a make-weight in order that the writer may treat of the dispute between his own followers and those of Apollos on more general grounds. We should guard ourselves, I believe, against supposing that there was at Corinth or anywhere else a Judaizing party who could claim Peter's authority; the inevitable name, side by side with those of Paul and Apollos or any other novel teacher, was the name of Peter.

It is clear, then, I think, that the evidence of St. Paul is entirely in accord with the evidence of the Gospels as to the prerogative position assigned to St. Peter in relation to the rest of the original Apostles. It is a further question how far the position claimed by St. Paul for himself can be reconciled with the position assigned to St. Peter in the Gospels, since at first sight the passage Gal. ii. 7, 8 appears to assume that what was entrusted to St. Peter was only "the Gospel of the circumcision," and that what was entrusted to St. Paul with regard to the uncircumcision was exactly the same thing—while in the Gospels the commission to St. Peter is stated quite generally in regard to the body of the faithful as a whole.

Perhaps the contrast is not really so fundamental as at first sight it may seem to be. We must never forget that, however sharply in this passage St. Paul, for the sake of defending the freedom of the Gospel he preached to the Gentiles, sets the circumcision and the uncircumcision over against one another, he does elsewhere emphasize with no less clearness the essential unity of both Jew and Gentile in Christ. In one sense, no doubt, there was a Jewish Christian Church and a Gentile Christian Church, for the one was bound by the Law (St. Paul never denies that), and the other was free from it; but in another and deeper sense both were one. "As many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ: there is no Jew or Gentile . . . for all of you are one in Christ Jesus. All who are Christ's are children of Abraham" in the New Israel (Gal. iii. 27, 28). In the new man there is no Gentile and Jew, no circumcision and uncircumcision, for all such distinctions are abolished, seeing

* I cannot bring myself to believe that in 1 Cor. i. 12 *ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ* has any other meaning than that of a sharp antithesis to the preceding clauses: "whatever party-names the rest of you may take, I, Paul, recognize no lesser name than Christ's." So Sanctus, the deacon of Vienne, *πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐπερωτώμενα ἀπεκρίνατο* "Christianus sum," Eus. *H.E.* v. 1, § 20.

that Christ is all things and in all things (Col. iii. 11). Moreover, in this unity there is a prerogative, at least in time, for the Jew: "to the Jew first and also to the Gentile" is the keynote of the whole argument of the Roman letter.

That is to say, the Gentile Christian Church was no separate creation: it was grafted on to an existing Jewish Christian Church. That already existing Church had St. Peter for its appointed chief, as St. Paul, we have seen, does abundantly recognize; we may in this respect paraphrase his Ἰουδαίῳ πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνί as equivalent to Πέτρῳ πρῶτον καὶ Παύλῳ. I think St. Paul would have subscribed *ex animo* to St. Luke's description in Acts of the place in the Church of the two great Apostles. If the New Israel was one, and the original foundation developed from the Jewish into the Jewish and Gentile Church, then, whatever parity might justly be claimed for the two missions and for their divinely appointed leaders, yet the one Church contained potentially from the beginning all developments that grew out of it. It may not be easy to construct for ourselves a synthesis that will give full effect to the two ideas "Peter" and "Peter and Paul." But both are present in the New Testament; both, I believe, are recognized by St. Paul, if we look at his evidence as a whole; both were held implicitly, though, as with other apparently contradictory conceptions, without any attempt at first of a formal theory to reconcile them, in the earliest Christian generations.

Nothing is more remarkable in the history of the early Church than the tenacity with which different elements were held in some sort of equipoise. Tradition preceded theology and conditioned it. It was the business of individual thinkers to apply reason and logic to the inherited *corpus* of Christian teaching as it had come down from apostles and evangelists. In this process of interpretation few thinkers can wholly avoid one-sidedness; it is not to be expected, and given the conditions of human nature it is hardly to be desired, that they should. But behind the individual thinker stood always the Spirit-bearing body, learning, assimilating, and sometimes formally, more often instinctively and informally, judging. Heresy meant the overemphasizing of some one aspect of the truth to the point not merely of neglecting but of contradicting some not less important aspect; creeds, if not in their first beginnings, at any rate from a rather early stage of their evolution, came to be the statement of positive elements of the Christian tradition endangered by one-sided developments.

That is, of course, primarily true of the fundamental beliefs of Christians. But a real sense of proportion was active over

the whole field; the passionate consciousness of the coherence of the Christian fellowship over against a hostile world did clearly tend to a large liberty of interpretation. The problems which vexed the first generation and divided Jewish and Gentile Christians were acute enough at the moment: they were solved and solved quickly, as much by the power of a common loyalty to one Master as by any formal decisions. For the mass of Christians party-spirit as between the different leaders faded away with quite extraordinary rapidity; St. Paul's missionary labours were more convincing even than his arguments: Gentile and Jewish Christians came together on the basis of freedom from the Law, and the watchword of their fellowship was "Peter and Paul." No doubt there were some on either side who proved recalcitrant. In Palestine and the neighbourhood a few Jewish Christians stood aside from Catholic unity (some in the end went so far as to regard St. Paul as "the enemy"), and preserved a precarious existence under such names as "Nazarenes." A much more aggressive movement singled out St. Paul as its sole authority, and attempted under Marcion to combine elements of Christianity with elements of Gnosticism on the basis of the total rejection of Judaism and the Old Testament. But the "great Church" went on its way unimpeded, and held fast to the double aspect of its tradition embodied in the names of both Apostles.

Herein lay the first importance of the Church of Rome. To Rome both Peter and Paul had come, drawn by the magnetism of the capital of the Empire; Paul in accordance with a long-proclaimed policy, Peter for what special reason we know not. From Rome St. Peter sent his epistle to the Christians of Asia Minor, and St. Paul, at an earlier period, the epistles of the first captivity, and afterwards the second epistle to Timothy, or whatever genuine fragments are contained in it. At Rome both Apostles died as martyrs during the persecution of Nero. And there in all probability—in St. Mark's case we may say with certainty—their two disciples published afterwards the Gospels "according to Mark" and "according to Luke."

The earliest documents and traditions connected with the Roman Church bear constant reference to "Peter and Paul"; never before the third century is the name of the one mentioned without corresponding mention of the other.

Some doubt may attach to the evidence of the Apocalypse. But it cannot be reasonably questioned that the thought of Rome, the imperial city, the stronghold of the anti-Christian power, is very close to the mind of the seer at certain points of his visions. The Beast is the emperor, and the "head slain to death and his death-wound was healed" (Apoc. xiii. 3) can

be no other than Nero, the expectation of whose return from the East was so vivid till the end of the first century.* Now "the Beast that comes up from the depth" or "from the sea" (xi. 7, xiii. 1) made war with the saints and overcame them and put them to death, and his principal victims were the two Witnesses—should we not rather render the Greek word literally as "Martyrs"?—whose bodies were exposed in the street of the "Great City, which is called spiritually Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified" (xi. 8); the Great City, equated with the Old Testament types of sin and oppression, responsible for the crucifixion of him who "suffered under Pontius Pilate," is the Roman power and nothing else. But who, then, were the two martyrs? They are described in terms borrowed from the Old Testament descriptions of Moses and Elias; but Moses and Elias had nothing to do with Rome, and were neither of them martyrs. But there were two martyrs of the first persecution, whose names were always associated in Christian tradition with Nero the first persecutor ("passi sunt sub Nerone"), the two greatest figures in early Christian history, St. Peter and St. Paul.† I believe myself that the Seer of the Apocalypse gives the earliest expression in extant Christian literature to the combination of the memory of the two great Apostles. Before the first century reached its close the two names were enshrined in common in the minds of all members, Jewish or Gentile, of the one Universal Church.

However this may be, the other testimonies which will be cited admit of no dispute. Hardly later than the Apocalypse, the letter of Clement and the Roman Church to the Church of Corinth opens with an appeal to the examples of Peter and Paul, cited as *par excellence* "the good apostles"; "Peter, who because of unrighteous envy endured not one or two but many labours, and so by martyrdom went to the place of glory‡ that was his due; Paul, who because of envy and strife displayed the prize of endurance, having seven times borne chains, having been chased as a fugitive, having been stoned, having been a herald of Christ in both East and West . . . bore witness before the supreme authorities in martyrdom, and so passed from the world and went to the holy place." Ignatius not many years later writes to the Romans (*ad Rom.* iv. 3) that he does not "lay commands on them like Peter and Paul: they were Apostles," he is simply a prisoner under sentence. Two generations after Clement and Ignatius Dionysius of Corinth

* It lingered on, in circles given to apocalyptic studies, even into the fifth; see my *Studies in Early Church History*, pp. 143-145.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 213, 214.

‡ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. May not this be an echo of Acts xii. 17, καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον?

(Eus. *H.E.* ii. 25, § 8, *cf.* iv. 23, §§ 9-11), addressing Pope Soter and the Roman Church, emphasizes the common teaching of both Apostles to Corinthian and Roman Christians alike and their common martyrdom. And the list of Roman *testimonia* culminates in the assertion of Gaius the Roman presbyter (*c.* A.D. 210; ap. Eus. *H.E.* ii. 25, §§ 6, 7) that he can show the " trophies " of the Apostles who established the Roman Church, on the Vatican hill and on the Ostian Way respectively—at the places, that is to say, where the basilicas of the two Apostles were later on erected under Constantine.

To the joint action of St. Peter and St. Paul early tradition further ascribes the foundation of the Roman line of bishops. St. Irenæus' great work *Against Heresies* was published under Pope Eleutherus, *c.* A.D. 180-190; and at the beginning of the third book his argument against the Gnostics leads him to appeal to the consentient tradition of the Catholic Church as expressed in the successions of the bishops of those sees whose episcopal lines went back to the Apostles, first and foremost among which was the Church founded and established at Rome " by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul." " Having founded and built up the church [at Rome], they entrusted to Linus the ministry of the episcopate," and so by successive steps " now in the twelfth place from the Apostles Eleutherus holds the κλῆρος of the episcopate." So, too, he dates the composition of St. Matthew's Gospel as synchronous with the time when " Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and founding the Roman Church."*

There is also strong probability, as Lightfoot was the first to show in his masterly inquiry into the " Early Roman Succession,"† that the list of the bishops of Rome, drawn up by an elder contemporary of Irenæus, Hegesippus, has been preserved to us through Epiphanius. We know from Eusebius that Hegesippus visited Rome soon after the middle of the second century, and " drew up a succession-list as far as Anicetus," διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου. The list itself is not given by Eusebius—perhaps, because he was going to cite the list of Irenæus, who was at once a more important writer than Hegesippus and carried the succession down to Eleutherus, two places further on than Anicetus. But Epiphanius gives us a list of the Roman bishops which there is good reason to think may be the lost list of Hegesippus: for (1) it stops at Anicetus; (2) it is independent of Irenæus and Eusebius, since

* Iren., III., i., 2 [1], iii. 1-3: most of the matter is cited in the original Greek by Eus. *H.E.*, v., 6, §§ 1, 4; 8, § 2.

† Lightfoot, *S. Clement of Rome* (1890), i. 202, 203, 327-333; Eus. *H.E.*, iv. 22, §§ 1-3; Epiph. *Haer.* xxvii. 6.

the name of the second pope is given as Κλῆτος, not Ἀνέγκλητος;* (3) it appears to rest on a document that was at once contempory and Roman, the paragraph being introduced with the words ἦλθεν δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἤδη πως Μαρκελλίνα τις . . . ἣ πολλοὺς ἐλυμήνατο ἐν χρόνοις Ἀνικήτου ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης; (4) mention is made in the immediate context of "certain ὑπομνηματισμοί," and Eusebius uses the words ὑπομνήματα, ὑπομνηματίζεσθαι, in reference to the work of Hegesippus. If, then, we may conclude that we have in Epiphanius the catalogue of Hegesippus, we note that he thrice gives the names "Peter and Paul," never the name Peter alone, in his account of the list.

Thus all authorities so far cited—and they extend throughout the whole of the second century, and indeed to the beginning of the third—never mention St. Peter alone in connection with the traditions of the Roman Church or the foundation of its episcopal succession, but always the names of St. Peter and St. Paul. It is clear beyond any possibility of cavil that in primitive times neither the Roman Church itself, nor Christians from outside who visited Rome or wrote about the history of its Church, ever thought of suppressing the name of St. Paul. But in the course of the third century a significant change came about, and the name of Peter began to be used alone.

Not, of course, in all connections, nor at first in the East. The pilgrims who—probably in the interval between the persecution of Valerian (A.D. 258) and the peace under Constantine†—visited the temporary resting-place of the bodies of the Apostles on the Appian Way, in what is now called the Catacomb of St. Sebastian, necessarily made mention of both names; what is noteworthy is that in a fair number of the inscriptions (or rather *graffiti*) the order of the names is not Peter and Paul, but Paul and Peter. So, too, Eusebius still normally speaks of both Apostles in relation to the Roman Church, and on two occasions (*H.E.*, iii. 2, iii. 21, when speaking of Linus and Clement respectively) even puts St. Paul first.

But in transcribing a catalogue it was easier to use one name than two; and as soon as the habit grew up of including the name of the Apostle-founder as the first of the list rather than as a title at the head of it—and this habit came into regular

* That is the only difference between the two lists; it is by a pure slip that the name of Hyginus is omitted in Lightfoot's translation of the passage from Epiphanius, p. 329.

† The inscriptions appear to be pre-Constantinian from the absence of any occurrence of the Constantinian monogram . And the relics were on the Vatican hill and on the Ostian Way when Gaius wrote about A.D. 210, and again from Constantine's foundation of the two great basilicas. They were probably translated to the Appian Way on June 29, A.D. 258.

use in the fourth century*—the use of a single name was dictated by the principle that there could only be one bishop at one time; and Eusebius himself adopts this usage in his *Chronicle,* "Post Petrum primus Romanam ecclesiam tenuit Linus."† Nevertheless the use emerges first in the Roman Church itself, and first in the third century; and perhaps it should not be entirely dissociated from the commencements of the idea of a Petrine primacy as attaching to Rome.

Hippolytus appears to be the earliest writer in whom we can detect the novel method of reckoning. If the passage about the "theologizing" of Christ in second-century authors, quoted in Eusebius v. 28, § 3, is rightly attributed to him, he named Pope Victor as "thirteenth from Peter"—that is to say, the older method of not including the Apostle-founder among the bishops is retained: Eleutherus was twelfth, as we have seen, to Irenæus, and therefore Victor, successor to Eleutherus, was thirteenth, without counting in the Apostles—but the mention of Peter and Paul makes way for the mention of Peter alone. So, too, in the papal catalogue which Hippolytus incorporated in his *Chronicle* of A.D. 234—"nomina episcoporum Romæ et quis quot annis præfuit," as the Latin version of the table of contents of the *Chronicle* has it—it would seem that only St. Peter, not St. Paul, had a place. At least, this is the case with the Liberian catalogue of A.D. 354, the first part of which is supposed with much reason to depend on Hippolytus; and if the title of the catalogue goes back to Hippolytus also, we can see a special reason why, as a chronicler, he names Peter alone without Paul, for he carries back the commencement of the line to the date of the Crucifixion. "Passus est Dominus noster Iesus Christus duobus Geminis coss., viii. kal. Apr., et post ascensum eius beatissimus Petrus episcopatum suscepit . . . Petrus ann. xxv, mens. i, d. viiii . . . passus autem cum Paulo."‡

But whatever doubt may hang over the actual phraseology of Hippolytus, and still more over the reasons that underlay for him the dropping of the name of St. Paul, the evidence of St. Cyprian is limpidly clear. We cannot be sure that Hippolytus was moved by "Petrine" tendency in the theological sense; but Cyprian's whole mind was riveted on the problem of Church organization and on the doctrinal basis of the episcopate, and he was the first writer to attempt to arrive at a definite theory. As in other matters, so in this, Christian theologians had expressed themselves at first on the basis of

* See my paper on "Apostolic Succession" in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry,* pp. 140-142.

† *Ibid.,* p. 139.

‡ Lightfoot, *St. Clement,* i., 252-261.

tradition alone; Irenæus, for example, when he appeals to the successions from the Apostles or to the prerogative position of the Roman community, takes Catholic tradition as a fact, and leaves theorizing to his Gnostic opponents. Nevertheless, the time was bound to come when Christian writers took the facts of tradition and tried to correlate them on a rational basis; and always their ultimate appeal was to the New Testament, and beyond all else to the words of Christ Himself.

Cyprian was a devoted student of Scripture, as well as a statesman and administrator. He was not brought up as a Christian, and was, indeed, a comparatively recent convert when he was chosen Bishop of Carthage, so that it is quite possible that he was from the start acquainted only with the newer Roman habit of the derivation of the Roman episcopal succession from St. Peter alone, and did not consciously or intentionally violate tradition when he suppressed the name of St. Paul. But anyhow it was he first who made the Petrine primacy in relation to the Roman Church an integral element of a theory of the episcopate. History has tended to single out St. Cyprian as the special upholder of the rights of other bishops, and of the episcopate at large, against autocratic claims of the Pope; but we must not forget what a decisive share he had in the formulation of the theory which saw a continuance of the primacy of Peter in the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

Two passages in his letters and the well-known passage in the *de unitate ecclesiæ* are of capital importance in this respect, and must be cited at some length.

(i.) *ep.* 43, 5: "Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum Domini uoce fundata. aliud altare constitui aut sacerdotium nouum fieri, præter unum altare et unum sacerdotium, non potest." It is not clear here whether "cathedra una" is the Roman see or the episcopate as a whole; the context suggests the latter. But, if so, the one episcopate, like the one Church, is to Cyprian in intimate relation of dependence on the one person of Peter.

(ii.) *de unit.* 4: "super unum ædificat ecclesiam, et quamuis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, [John xx. 21] . . . tamen, ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur . . . hanc ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? qui ecclesiæ renititur et resistit, in ecclesia se esse confidit?" So Cyprian wrote: later on, in the sixth century, the i's were dotted and the t's were crossed by some Roman Christian who

very likely did not think he was doing more than drawing out what Cyprian meant. But "qui cathedram Petri super quam fundata est ecclesia deserit, in ecclesia se esse confidit ?"* was exactly what St. Cyprian did not say, and could not have said. To him the Church was founded on Peter, not on the Chair of Peter. And though he entirely believed that the privilege of Peter among the Apostles belonged also to the Pope among the bishops, that no more prevented him as a fellow-bishop from criticizing the Pope when the Pope seemed to him to be wrong, than Peter's privilege safeguarded Peter from the criticism of his fellow-Apostle Paul.

(iii.) *ep.* lix. 14: "nauigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, ab schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides apostolo prædicante [Rom. i. 8] laudata est." Cyprian is speaking of an embassy which the Carthaginian schismatics had sent to Rome in the hope of securing recognition for their bishop; and as he is writing to Pope Cornelius to guard against such recognition being given at Rome, he naturally goes as far as he can in the language of deference to the position of his correspondent.

But there is no inconsistency between Cyprian's attitude here and elsewhere. He has a clear-cut theory of which the first element is the essential identity of the episcopal and apostolic office, and the second is the essential identity of the position of Peter and of his successors at Rome. What Peter was among the Apostles, that his successor was among Catholic bishops, the symbol and source of unity. What Peter had not among the Apostles, that is any difference in dignity or authority, that the Pope had not in regard to other members of the episcopate. In each case there was, so to say, a college and a head. But the head could not act apart from his colleagues; moreover, though the Bishop of Rome was successor of St. Peter, and inherited all the prerogative that Peter had in relation to the other Apostles, there was, of course, one thing that he could not inherit. Peter was the original foundation on which Christ built His Church. Cyprian would never have said that the Church was founded on Peter and his successors.

Cyprian, then, was the first writer to construct a theology, if we may use the word, of the episcopate; and in that theology a definite place was accorded to the Bishop of Rome. And

* In the text of this interpolation, as given in Hartel's apparatus (at the foot of p. 212), the sentence preceding this is printed in the form "hanc et Pauli unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit ?" "Et Pauli" breaks the connection, and is surely not what the interpolator wrote or thought. I conjecture that it was a marginal gloss on the words "cathedram Petri"; some early reader of the ancestor of the MS. still thought of the Roman See as the chair of Peter "and Paul."

Cyprian's influence in the Western Church was so immense that it may be taken as certain that his teaching in this matter had quite far-reaching results. Whatever acuteness of difference separated the policy of Cyprian from the policy of Pope Stephen in the controversy on Re-baptism, the Roman Church, after Stephen, wisely and courageously overlooked. Wisely, for to Cyprian must be allotted a very large importance in the doctrinal development of the claims of the Roman see.

But it cannot be denied that Cyprian's theory, based though it was all along on an appeal to Scripture, did some violence to tradition. It is a striking example of the onesidedness that can follow from an appeal to Scripture where account is not taken of the evidence of tradition and of history; for it will often be found that history and tradition have their roots in some neglected aspect of those New Testament Scriptures from which, after all, tradition took its start. The early tradition of the Roman Church, and indeed of the Church at large, had always connected the name of Paul with the name of Peter. It is that tradition, and not Cyprian's replacement of it, which really corresponds best to the evidence of the New Testament as a whole. No statement of this evidence can be permanently satisfactory which does not find a place, side by side with the original and single prerogative of Peter, for the dual watchword "Peter and Paul."

One illustration of the survival of older conceptions even in the West, and even in that part of the West which from earliest times stood in special subordination to the Roman Church,* is curious enough and significant enough to be cited here; Lucifer of Cagliari *de non parcendo in deum delinquentibus* (*c* A.D. 359), § 11, ed. Hartel 233, 6-13. He quotes John x. 11-13, and continues, "Quid itaque nobis erat gerendum . . . numquidnam fuerat dignum non pastores sed mercennarios exhibere nos? Petro dicit beato 'Pasce agnos meos' et iterum 'Pasce ouiculas meas': et ut 'ueniens lupus' uis eos qui successores extitisse inueniuntur beato Petro uicem gerere mercennariorum?" When Lucifer claims that all bishops are successors to St. Peter and therefore inherit the commission to St. Peter to feed the lambs and little sheep, he is no doubt incorrect in his exegesis of the passage, so far as its original scope extended;

* Sardinia was one of the "decem prouinciæ"—equivalent to Central and Southern Italy—for which it would appear that the Roman bishop consecrated originally all bishops, and at any rate all metropolitans. Such seems to be the meaning of the sixth canon of Nicæa, when it ratifies the direct authority of the Bishop of Alexandria over all Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis on the ground that a similar privilege attached to the Bishop of Rome. See my note on the "suburbicarian regions," *Ecclesiæ Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, i., 150.

but what is important is that he had clearly no sense of any incompatibility between the *essential* position of St. Peter (and therefore *a fortiori* of St. Peter's successors) and of every individual bishop. I do not think that his underlying thought necessarily differed from that of St. Cyprian; I am not even sure that it would have been disowned by the Roman Church of his day. But rather soon after his time, under the pontificate of Pope Damasus (A.D. 366-384), a long step forward was taken in formulating the claim of the Roman Church to be the exclusive inheritor of all and more than all that the New Testament tells us of the prerogative of St. Peter.

C. H. TURNER.

REFLECTIONS ON THE REPORT OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS COMMISSION.—I.

SIMILES are always dangerous in the hands of the inexpert, but the present system of Ecclesiastical Courts may without extravagance be compared to a building having a top-heavy and incongruous superstructure which not only has seriously injured and distorted the lower portions of the building, but by its very existence has prevented the execution of normal and periodical repairs thereto because they were felt to be futile.

Forsaking all metaphor, the problem of the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts is twofold—namely, the devising of a final court of appeal free of the objections to which the Judicial Committee is subject, and the reform of the lower Courts, so that they shall be better fitted to do their work.

It is the primary merit of the report of the recent Commission that it faces both aspects of the problem. But the very fact that it has done so involves an element of danger. Some there are who retain a strange and curious affection for the Privy Council as a court of final appeal. These would make almost any concession as to the lower Courts, provided the jurisdiction of the Privy Council were retained. Should any such be led to suppose that by concessions of this sort the objections of Anglo-Catholics to the Privy Council could be appeased or bought off, much confusion, disappointment and delay must result.

There are others, now very few in number, who beguile themselves into supposing that the existing system without substantial alteration could still be made effective by a display of firmness. Amongst those, however, who may be suspected of harbouring this opinion, I perceive none who combine energy,

pertinacity, and influence in a greater degree than those qualities were manifested in Archbishops Tait and Thomson, who tried and failed to do this. No new attempt of this kind could count upon the active support of the Crown, the hesitating but valuable support of the Government, or so large a body of favourable opinion in the country as those prelates could rely upon. A much increased volume of opposition, however, could be safely predicted.

It is the purpose of this article to consider the recommendations of the Commission as to the Diocesan Courts, but it has seemed wise to say what has been said lest this limited object should lend colour to the view that reform of the Final Court of Appeal is not of the essence of the problem. Unless a real effort be made to remove the existing objections to that Court, all reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts is vanity of vanities.

I

The first question which naturally arises with regard to the Diocesan Court is as to the person who should preside therein. The Court is the Bishop's Court; it exists for no other purpose than the exercise of his jurisdiction. *A priori* it might naturally be thought that he alone should be its president. But those considerations which have operated in nearly all civilized societies to support the separation of the executive and the judiciary have had their effect upon the polity of the Church, in which a bishop is of necessity an executive and administrative official. His efficiency in the latter capacities is the strongest argument against his sitting regularly as judge in his own Court. Thus we find the ecclesiastical law of England requiring him, conformably to the Canon Law, to appoint an Official Principal to sit for him, and we can also find, if we seek them, prohibitions in the Canon Law against his sitting in person. Indeed, there are persons who hold that he is by Canon Law debarred in effect from sitting in person at all. This theory the recent Commission has not thought it worth while to examine, and certainly it accords ill with the Anglican doctrine of the inherent authority of the bishop. If there be a Universal Ordinary it may be comprehensible that he should require his delegates to delegate still further the authority given to them, which is never theirs save by delegation. But to say in the same breath that an authority is inherent but yet cannot be exercised save by delegation is startling, and requires more justification than its propounders seem to realize.

The existing practice of all the English Dioceses, which has undergone little alteration for some centuries at least, but has

been overridden in some respects by statutes of the last century, shows that, conformably to law, an Official Principal is always appointed, and, outside the Metropolitical Dioceses, he almost always holds also the office of Vicar-General. The term "Chancellor" in this connection is of comparatively modern origin; it does not appear at all in most, if in any, of the Patents used in the older dioceses, but it is now usually treated as properly descriptive of the holder of the two offices of Official Principal and Vicar-General. But further than has been stated the practice of the English Dioceses is not uniform. In many dioceses (the Commission of 1881 stated the number to be sixteen—see R. *v.* Tristram [1902], 1 K. B. 816, at p. 830) the Patent reserves some jurisdiction to the bishop, but the forms of such reservations vary greatly. Whether these reservations in any shape are pre-Reformation in origin is uncertain (see R. *v.* Tristram aforesaid). The form in question in R. *v.* Tristram was that of the Diocese of Chichester, and it was held to be legal and effective. The words were:

"Nevertheless first consulting us and our successors, and having our consent in case either party earnestly crave our judgment."

It is to be observed of this form that the power of the bishop to intervene depends not on his own volition, but on that of one of the parties; that, supposing all conflicting statutes to be repealed, the right of the bishop to sit whenever he sees fit, which the recent Commission recommends, could not be assented thereunder, and that in practice considerable difficulties would almost certainly arise in its operation.

But there is another form of reservation which is believed to be somewhat more extensively in use, and the legality of which is, if possible, less open to question than that of the form above set out. This form contemplates a procedure so like that advocated by the Commission that it is desirable to set it out in full as it appears in the Lichfield Patent. It is as follows:

"Nevertheless reserving to ourselves and our successors Bishops of Lichfield aforesaid the power of executing the said offices (*i.e.*, those of Vicar-General and Official Principal) when and as often as it shall please us, either solely or together with you."

It will be observed that if the statutes discussed below were repealed everything proposed by the Commission as to the constitution of the Court itself (I am not at present dealing with the question of assessors) could be effected under this reservation without any new legislation whatever. Indeed, its ambit

exceeds that of the Commission's recommendations, for it permits the bishop to sit alone.*

But the composition of the Court is in many cases not now regulated by the terms of the Patent, but by those of certain Victorian statutes, from the consideration of which much may be learnt, even though it be chiefly what to avoid. The first is, of course, the Church Discipline Act, 1840. Some Anglo-Catholics appear to think that this Act can be coupled with the Public Worship Regulation Act, as having been passed "to put down ritualism." This is quite untrue in fact, and indeed no one could suppose it who should reflect that it was enacted five years before Newman's secession and seventeen years before *Liddell v. Westerton* was decided. It was, in fact, promoted and supported by those bishops, not in the aggregate very numerous, who were keenly desirous that the higher standard in matters of conduct which was coming to be expected of the clergy (largely as a result of the Oxford Movement) should obtain due recognition in the Ecclesiastical Courts. The principal business of those Courts was testamentary and matrimonial; the judges thereof were recruited from a close and highly conservative body the official connection of which with the Church was indeed of the closest, but the actual interest of the members of which in the affairs of the Church might be of the slightest; and, rightly or wrongly, the promoters of the Act, 1840, were persuaded that the existing judges were not eminently fitted to recognize and enforce this higher standard of clerical duty.

Hence the provisions that in the case of "any clerk . . . who may be charged with any offence against the laws ecclesiastical or concerning whom there may exist scandal or evil report as having offended against the said laws" (section 3), if the matter shall go to trial, "the bishop shall proceed to hear the cause" (section 11), and that "no criminal suit or proceeding shall be instituted . . . otherwise than is hereinbefore enacted" (section 23). Thus the effect of the Act was, not to give the bishop a power to sit as judge when he should please even though he had not reserved such a power in the Patent, but to make him the sole and necessary judge in every case to which the Act applied, though he was obliged to sit with assessors of whom his Chancellor need not of necessity be one. But the Act also gave the bishop power to send a cause to the Provincial Court by letters of request, and, so far as the latter Court was concerned, the Act did not displace the judge by the Archbishop. In the result, the bishop became the sole com-

* The position of the Chancellor under this Patent may be somewhat uncertain if the bishop elects to execute the office of Official Principal with him. Is he, then, a mere assessor, or must he concur in any judgment of the bishop?

petent judge in cases of alleged immorality and misconduct, which are the very cases which by almost universal consent should be tried by a trained lawyer, and are also the cases in which there is the most likelihood that he has taken some prior administrative action which disables him from sitting in person. From the duty of sitting in person a bishop could not escape (notwithstanding that Patents granted after the statute continued according to their terms to confer full jurisdiction on the Chancellors), save by sending a case to the Provincial Court for trial. So it came about that the bulk of criminal causes of any gravity were sent to the Provincial Court almost as a matter of course, a consequence which was manifestly deplorable. It may, indeed, be conceded that a power to transmit causes direct to the Provincial Court by letters of request is desirable, more particularly in these times when Diocesan Chancellors take, and are expected to take, some part in the general affairs of the dioceses, and, indeed, of the Church at large, and may thereby find themselves in particular circumstances as unfit to try a cause as the bishop himself often is; but a system which virtually compels the trial of serious causes outside the Diocesan Court is absurd and inconvenient in practice and papal in effect if not in theory.

The Public Worship Regulation Act need not detain us. That ill-starred Act did not contemplate proceedings in the Diocesan Courts, and therefore the next Act of importance is the Clergy Discipline Act of 1892. By this Act the Chancellor is not only restored to the position of judge in the Consistory Court in relation to charges of immorality against a clergyman, but he is made the only competent judge in such cases, so that the bishop cannot sit in person, any reservation in the Chancellor's Patent notwithstanding. The Act also makes important provisions as to assessors, which will be considered hereafter, and, in common with the Church Discipline Act, it regulates various matters not here enumerated, since they are irrelevant to our immediate purpose. It will be seen that in substance the object and effect of the Act of 1892 is to undo what the Act of 1840 had done. Both Acts are alike in ignoring the terms of the Chancellor's Patent. The former makes the grant of jurisdiction to the Chancellor a mere nullity, so far as concerns criminal suits against the clergy; the latter restores a considerable part of that jurisdiction to the Chancellor, but by virtue of the Act and not of the Patent, and it makes void to the extent of its operation any reservation in the Patent of jurisdiction to the bishop. I cannot but think that the complete ignoring of the terms of the Patent by both these Acts has largely contributed to such loss of "moral authority" as the

Consistory Courts have suffered, nor is it a complete answer to this consideration that the Act of 1892 had the assent of the Convocations.

The story cannot be completed without some reference to the Benefices Act, 1898. A future student of ecclesiastical history who fails to take into account the prevailing political conditions will, I think, find it very difficult to account for the provisions of this Act as to the disposal of charges of neglect of duty against the clergy. As part of the machinery to deal with the evil of non-residence, the Pluralities Act, 1838, had provided for a commission of clergymen on whose report that the duties of a benefice were inadequately performed the bishop was enabled to require the incumbent to appoint a curate. By an amending Act of 1885, the composition of the Commission was varied, the procedure strengthened, and power to take evidence upon oath and to compel the attendance of witnesses was given. But though the proceedings before the Commission were thereby made much more like a trial before a Court, it remained true that as a result of its proceedings the negligent incumbent could suffer no penalty save the compulsory deduction from his income of the curate's stipend. But the Act of 1898 not merely gave the bishop power himself to appoint the curate, but also power to inhibit the incumbent either for a time or without limit, and provided an appeal to a tribunal which certainly is not an Ecclesiastical Court. Thus the proceedings became indistinguishable from those of a trial to be followed by a punishment, but since the Commission was not technically a Court at all, still less an Ecclesiastical Court, none of the canonical punishments including deprivation could ever be inflicted. It may well be asked why, if in substance a trial was to be held and punishment awarded, the existing Ecclesiastical Courts were ignored in favour of a transitory body most cumbrous in practice.* It is believed that the explanation is to be found in the politico-ecclesiastical situation in 1898. The passage of the Act of 1892 had provoked violent and unexpected controversy in Parliament, and at least the semblance of great opposition to the increased powers of enforcing discipline given by that Act. Further, the Lincoln Judgment had been followed by a period of comparative relief from litigation as to ceremonial and the like. The ecclesiastical authorities, while anxious to provide a more effective method of dealing with negligence, wished to avoid the controversy which it was feared would follow any attempt to deal with the

* Some years ago a Commission was unable to hear all the evidence at the first day's sitting. It proved impossible to find any day on which the majority of the Commissioners could again assemble for over four months, and for long it seemed that no such day ever would be found.

Ecclesiastical Courts themselves. Hence the Act of 1898, which provides for proceedings in substance judicial under the guise of administrative machinery, ignores all the Ecclesiastical Courts, and, for that reason, gives no more adequate power of punishment than the absurdity of perpetual inhibition of a person who yet retains the cure of souls.

Sir Robert Phillimore, in the preface to the first edition of his *Ecclesiastical Law*, speaks of the difficulty of reducing the law of the English Church to a system, and in this connection he mentions particularly "imperfections arising in great measure from the hasty and crude legislation of modern times." Of many of the statutes we have been considering he could not then have spoken save in the spirit of prophecy, but, looked at as a whole, his phrase applies to them with remarkable aptness.

The recommendations of the recent Commission are greatly strengthened if regarded from the standpoint at which earlier legislation had arrived. Not their least merit consists in the fact that they contain a proposal to repeal most of such legislation—the Church Discipline Act, the Public Worship Regulation Act, and "other enactments inconsistent with the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts proposed" (paragraph 65). The latter words must include, as I hope and believe, large portions at least of the Clergy Discipline Act, 1892, and the Benefices Act, 1898. I do not think the Commission actually name the latter Act anywhere, but surely no human being will be found to support the trial of charges of negligence before the extraordinary tribunals now existing when confidence in the Consistory Courts is restored. This repeal being effected, it is proposed that the Chancellor shall retain his position as Judge ordinary, subject, however, to an unrestricted right in the bishop to sit whenever he sees fit, and subject also to a statutory power in the Chancellor to consult the bishop on any matter involving the exercise of his discretion when sitting alone, the decision of the bishop to be binding on the Chancellor in such cases. This is, I hope, a fair summary of the proposals apart from those as to assessors, consideration of which I postpone, and for myself I welcome them, nevertheless permitting myself to make two criticisms. As to the power of consulting the bishop, it is no secret that such consultation is not unknown at present, but now the Chancellor is alone responsible for the decision. If it be known that the Chancellor will certainly or most probably consult the bishop, and that his decision will be binding, no long time will elapse before parties and their advisers will claim that they should be allowed to address their arguments to the tribunal which will decide upon them, and not to an intermediary. To permit this would be highly incon-

venient, as it would substitute two hearings for one; to forbid it will produce a sense of grievance.

The unrestricted right of the bishop to sit in person is proposed to be conferred by law. *Prima facie*, this involves the ignoring or overriding of the Patent in a similar manner to that followed by the earlier statutes. A Chancellor is a delegate; his "moral authority" follows from that fact alone. In so far as his authority is derived *dehors* the instrument of delegation or that instrument is ignored, the fact that he is a delegate is obscured or even contradicted. The authors of the Public Worship Regulation Act discovered this to their cost. I could wish that means could be devised to avoid any further statutory overriding of the Patent, particularly in those dioceses where the Patent in use does in fact now purport to reserve full powers to the bishop. It must be admitted, however, that it is easier to propound this difficulty than to suggest a practical method of surmounting it.

ALAN LESLIE.

(*To be concluded.*)

HENRY LOWTHER CLARKE, FIRST ARCHBISHOP OF MELBOURNE: A PERSONAL STUDY

NOT every bishop that passes away can be the subject of a personal study in these columns. But the insertion of the present sketch is justifiable for several reasons. Its subject was a potent influence in Australian Church life. After resigning his see in 1920 he made many new friends in England. He warmly welcomed the starting of THEOLOGY, and lost no opportunity of gaining new subscribers. "I rejoice in THEOLOGY," he would say, "and endorse nearly everything I read in it." The devotional expression of the faith of many who contributed to it was alien to him—he never completely outgrew his early training with which, as he said, "I was brought up to hate a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic"—but he shared their faith. May the following appreciation help readers to see the dignity and beauty of certain nineteenth-century ideals of life which are in danger of being obscured.

Henry Lowther Clarke was born at Firbank Vicarage in Westmoreland in 1850. He was educated at home by his father and, later, at the neighbouring Sedbergh School, then in low water as regards numbers and efficiency. But the old-fashioned classical discipline which he received from his father combined with his private study of mathematics formed intellectual

habits which lasted a lifetime. From Sedbergh he went to St. John's College, Cambridge, as a Sizar and Exhibitioner, being elected to a Foundation Scholarship after two years. His mother had been left a widow with five children. She took a little house in Cambridge, and on an income which never exceeded £300 a year sent her three sons to the University. What the burden meant to her may be gathered from a letter written to Henry Lowther, to be read after her death: "I hope she [your wife] may not be left with such a charge as I was; the responsibility is heavy. I trusted in God and I have been mercifully dealt with. I have gone to bed many a time half broken and hysterical, but I put my trust in God, and in the morning I felt a new creature, able to struggle with the coming day's work."

The future Bishop's life was necessarily Spartan. He refused all social invitations, for how could he return them? For St. John's he cherished a deep affection. He died just too soon to see its boat after 50 years go Head of the River in the May Races, which would have given him the keenest pleasure. Sedbergh, too, never had a more loyal son; fortunately he lived long enough to write her history.

After taking a high degree, Seventh Wrangler, Henry Lowther Clarke was ordained, and served his first curacy in Hull. There he married Alice Lovell Kemp, of whom he said to one of his sons: "I was a raw lad from the North. I had character, intellect, initiative—that was all. Whatever I have of gentleness and manners I learned gradually from your mother." This was an over-statement—the natural refinement of his Northern home with its piety, simplicity, and intellectual interests was considerable—but none the less touching. The Church of England in the future may produce a mainly celibate priesthood, but a large proportion of her clergy in the past have been better ministers as well as men by reason of their wives.

After two years in Hull he became Vicar of Hedon, six miles away, a tiny municipal borough with a minster-like church. His life there can be summarized in his own words. "Every afternoon without fail I turned out at 2.30 and visited until 5. There were no services except on Sunday and on Wednesday, when I gave a Bible Reading in church to about 70 people. There were no meetings in the parish, and no clerical gatherings except once a year when the Rural Dean invited us to his house during the strawberry season." He would go on to contrast the heightened activities but, he believed, diminished efficiency of present-day clergy.

From Hedon he went to York, first to be a house-master at St. Peter's School, then to be Vicar of St. Martin's, Coney

Street. The schoolmaster episode was his one failure. He had insufficient patience, at least at that period of his life, with the average boy. Probably for most of us an experience of failure is part of God's discipline for our lives. As a York Vicar he became a man of affairs, especially in regard to educational administration. There and at Dewsbury, in the West Riding, he was Chairman of the School Board, a Governor of several Secondary Schools, a founder of others, and a prime mover in the investigations which resulted in the Education Act of 1902. At Melbourne his interest in education had full scope, and he will long be remembered in Australia as a founder and benefactor of Church Schools. Education was a passion with him. Coming on both sides of a long line of "statesmen" (small Cumberland and Westmoreland farmers owning their own land), he had a supreme sense of the value of the family, that each member should do his best to hand on the lamp. But he was large-minded enough to be almost equally keen on the education of other men's sons.

In 1902, when he was Vicar of Huddersfield, two Australian laymen were travelling through England on the look-out for a suitable man to recommend to their diocese as Bishop of Melbourne. Their choice fell on Henry Lowther Clarke. His consecration in St. Paul's Cathedral was one of the last public acts of Archbishop Temple.

This is not the place in which to speak of his achievements as Bishop and, presently, Archbishop, but, since we are studying the man rather than his work, an incident which profoundly affected him cannot be passed over. A clergy discipline case of extraordinary complexity arose. For some years the Archbishop was compelled to keep silence and stand almost alone, misjudged by many friends, the victim of continual obloquy. At last a newspaper published so shocking a libel that he was obliged to bring an action in order to clear his character. For three days he stood in the box, giving evidence with great skill. The other side threw up the case, apologizing unreservedly and offering damages. It was a great personal triumph. His justice and mercy were vindicated and the period thenceforward to the date of his resignation witnessed a succession of splendid achievements. The Bishop of Wakefield, writing in *The Guardian*, said: "He was always the same: like some great ship set upon a steady course, he went forward unshaken in storms of controversy and sorrow alike." But which of us is really unmoved? The sorrows of this time wounded him sorely and probably shortened his life. When a case of clergy discipline is discussed, how many think of the heavy burden of sorrow which the Bishop is bearing?

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 was the culmination of his official career. He took a prominent part on the Committee which dealt with Reunion, but saw the difficulties more plainly than most of the Bishops, thanks to his experience in Australia of negotiations between Anglicans and Presbyterians.

After the Conference, on his seventieth birthday, the Archbishop resigned his see. Having been responsible for a measure which practically compelled the clergy to retire at that age, he felt that no other course was possible. He bought a house at Lymington, Hampshire, in which Coventry Patmore had lived, and settled down to enjoy his newly-found leisure. After fifty years' cessation from classical studies he began Latin and Greek again, soaking himself in Virgil and Horace, and making a translation of the whole of Homer with his own hand. (An attempt to read Plato was unsuccessful.) This was partly for recreation, but partly also with a view of forming a literary style, in which respect he felt himself to be deficient. His *History of Sedbergh School* (1925) shows that Homer had taught him how to tell a story, and *Death and the Hereafter* (1926) is a model of a simple exposition of a great theme. Besides these books he wrote after his retirement a massive volume on *Constitutional Church Government* in the Anglican Communion (1925), and many pamphlets and articles on a variety of subjects, including the antiquities of Hampshire. So long as his health lasted he preached constantly both in the neighbourhood and at a distance. And he played his part as a wise and moderating counsellor in current Church movements, never seeking to overstep the limits necessarily imposed upon a retired bishop.

Few clergymen have had such an influence throughout life upon laymen, whether of the governing or labouring classes, and it is worth while to try to analyze the sources of that influence.

1. His characteristic virtue was *justice*. You would naturally describe him as a *righteous* man. His practical religion expressed itself largely in the probity and disinterestedness of his administration. The business men with whom he worked felt that here was one whom they could trust. There was no trace in him of that dexterity which lay critics sometimes find in the clergy. Needless to say, his justice was not always appreciated as such. His imagination remained undeveloped to the end, with the result that, though he always wished to be sympathetic, he sometimes found it hard to put himself in the place of others.

2. *Simplicity* was the secret of the Archbishop's strength. Soon after he went to Melbourne a lady, asked what they thought of their new Bishop, said: "As a preacher he's dis-

appointing, socially he's not grand enough for us, and altogether he's much too good for us." He seemed to transcend class distinctions. He loved the refinement (though not the luxury) of a great house, but was perfectly at home in a cottage. A pipe was his one personal indulgence, and his last years were marked by great simplicity.

The same simplicity was manifested in other departments of life. Philosophy was a closed book to him, and he had no patience with theological subtleties. The half-lights and nuances of modern speculation were meaningless to him. Talking to his son about the Incarnation, he would brush aside all arguments, laying down his pipe and saying with profound reverence: "*He is God.*" So child-like was he in his ways that in the presence of one or other of his family he would say: "I'm going to say my prayers," and kneel down forthwith. Cross-word puzzles delighted him; so did obvious stories, repeated frequently with infectious pleasure.

3. By the side of his simplicity, or rather springing from it, must be put his *dignity*. Very simple words from the pulpit had an extraordinary effect upon listeners. "He does lay it out so plain," said a poor woman. The subject was nearly always an incident from the Gospels, lovingly expounded with a minimum of application. A method of treatment which was obvious when he first adopted it became a rare and fascinating survival in a generation which reads the Bible so little. His utterances became more impressive as he grew older, thanks in part to the dignity of his bearing and voice, to which the Bishop of Wakefield has testified: "That dignified presence and calm intellectual countenance . . . that characteristic English voice, quiet yet masterly." The Bishop of Southampton wrote in similar terms: "I never passed through Lymington without looking in on the wise and beautiful old gentleman. . . ."

4. A fourth characteristic may surprise those who knew him in the middle years and stood in awe of his commanding presence—*gentleness*. To this the friends of his old age testified with surprising unanimity. He was a learner all his life. As after 70 he struggled through Homer with the help of Munro's Grammar and Autenrieth's Dictionary, so he learned the passive virtues. The last year of ill-health was God's final lesson, which those who loved him best would not have had him spared.

Henry Lowther Clarke was one whose religion expressed itself in a righteous life and a continuing sense of God's ruling of human affairs rather than in devotions. In this respect he never overcame the limitations of his early training, the plunging

into parish work without preparation which was almost universal in the seventies. He never went to a retreat in his life, and the Holy Communion did not mean to him what it has come to mean for most of us. His private prayers, though intense, were always short. The child-like simplicity of his character, to which reference has been made, appeared in this. Devotion was to him a child's trust in its Father, rather than the passionate striving of the loving soul for union with the heavenly Bridegroom.

Yet here, too, he was a learner up to the end. Two books were his constant companions during the last two or three years: the so-called *Meditations of St. Augustine,* which he used in a sixteenth-century edition, and Bishop Andrewes' *Devotions.* The following quotation, spoken by Hooker on his death bed, formed a regular part of his evening prayers as he prepared for sleep and the death which it mirrors: "I have lived to see this world is made up of perturbations, and I have been long preparing to leave it and gathering comfort for the dreadful hour of making my account with God, and though I have by His grace loved Him in my youth and feared Him in mine age and laboured to have a conscience void of offence to Him and to all men, yet if Thou, O Lord, wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiss, who can abide it? And therefore, where I have failed, Lord, show mercy to me, for I plead not my righteousness but the forgiveness of my unrighteousness for His merits Who died to purchase a pardon for penitent sinners."

The character we have sketched may seem deficient in the special priestly virtues. But a simple and broadly human outlook upon life, a refusal to attach undue importance to detail, a devotion to the few things that really matter, and a dislike of over-elaboration and unnecessary emphasis, are of the essence of the Gospel. Such was his outlook, both by temperament and through experience; and it was of such sincerity, so English alike in its strength and limitation, and so abundantly blessed in its influence on the lives of Englishmen and Australians, that we are justified in claiming that it contained values which must be conserved if the priests of the English Church are to exercise their ministry faithfully in the years to come.

W. K. L. C.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among contributors to the present number, Mr. Alan Leslie, who writes on Ecclesiastical Courts, is Chancellor of the Diocese of Lichfield. His article will be followed by another early in the New Year, dealing with the Provincial and Final Courts.

We hope to publish shortly, in connection with the second edition of the volume, some appreciations and criticisms of *Essays Catholic and Critical*, by the following non-Anglican scholars: Mgr. P. Batiffol, a member of the Malines conferences, and a recognized authority on Church history; Professor Bulgakoff, who is attached to the Russian seminary in Paris; Dr. Yngwe Brilioth, the Swedish scholar, whose study of the Oxford movement attracted widespread interest last year; and Dr. Anderson Scott, of Westminster College, Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

In an article, "The Virgin Birth and Recent Discussion," which appeared in the August issue of Theology (p. 86), the following passage occurs:

"The crucial verses" (Luke) "i. 34, 35 are a later insertion, inconsistent with the rest of the story of the Annunciation. Therefore, when Luke wrote chapters i. and ii., he had no knowledge of the Virgin Birth. But—and this is Dr. Taylor's special contribution to the debate—the language of the two verses is thoroughly Lukan, and no suspicion of textual criticism appears. The inference is that Luke added them himself in a final revision of the work."

Now it is pleasing to have clear recognition of the undeniable fact that MSS., Versions, and Fathers are practically unanimous in favour of the genuineness of the two verses. Indeed, I doubt whether stronger evidence can be found in favour of any passage whatever in the New Testament. In addition, the verdict of linguistic evidence is the same as that of textual. The two verses contain several words and phrases characteristic of Luke's style, as may be seen from Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticæ*.

But I am somewhat sceptical about the "later-insertion" theory, and for this reason among others: If vv. 34, 35 are a later insertion into the narrative, so likewise must be v. 36.

In the earlier part of the chapter the angel has announced to Zacharias two things: (1) His wife Elisabeth, though old, will in a way above nature bear him a son; and (2) this son will fill a very important and wonderful office in God's purposes towards His people.

Now let us turn to the Annunciation. Omit vv. 34, 35, and the birth of Jesus is paralleled to that of John the Baptist in the second of these two particulars—for Jesus is likewise to fill a very important and wonderful office in God's purposes, one, indeed, far more important and wonderful than John's—but it is not at all parallel to the first, for it is in no way above nature or supernatural.

Yet, when in v. 36 the angel wishes to confirm the announcement he has just made by a declaration of what has happened to Elisabeth, he says nothing about the latter particular, but mentions only the former. Where is the relevancy of this, if the birth of Jesus is not to be in some way above nature?

And it is not merely a question of relevancy. "Behold, Elisabeth thy kinswoman, she *also* hath conceived," etc. That little word "*also*" is neither more nor less than a clear assertion that the birth of Jesus will resemble that of John in possessing a supernatural character. In other words, v. 36 assumes the presence of vv. 34, 35. Then, too, v. 37 has much more significance in its position after vv. 34-36 than it would have if it immediately followed v. 33. If, then, vv. 34, 35 be a later insertion, so also must be v. 36 and probably v. 37. Hence my scepticism as to the "later-insertion" theory.

Yours faithfully,
J. W. TYRER.

[We are grateful to Mr. Tyrer for his letter; but it is only fair to point out that Dr. Lowther Clarke himself made the same point, though rather more briefly (*op. cit.* p. 87).—ED.]

STUDIES IN TEXTS

(*a*) LUKE xvii. 20.

The study of Luke xvii. 20 in THEOLOGY for March, 1924, is very interesting, but hardly gets to the bottom of what is a curiously intricate passage presenting in brief compass two dubious and almost unparalleled words. A contributory study may not be superfluous, especially as the important word ἐντὸς has received too little attention.

On the careful scrutiny already there made of the phrase μετὰ παρατηρήσεως it will be enough to make two comments. First, that in all the six instances of παρατηρέω in N.T. the meaning seems "to be on the lookout for." As translation that will not always serve, but it indicates the idea which the verb expresses. And there is no reason for doubting that the same idea underlies the substantive. Secondly, in the example cited from the *Quæstiones* this would seem the clue to a right interpretation: ἄλλο πάλιν κρίμα τοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως ἁμαρτάνοντος παρὰ τὸν ἀναισχύντως ἑαυτὸν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἐκδιδόντα. Is it justifiable to say, "Here sinning μετ. παρ. is favourably contrasted with sinning ἀναισχ.; and since the latter qualification means with 'shameless disregard of *appearances*,' the former must mean 'secretly,' or at least with the precaution of a man who tries to escape detection"? The latter clause means one who shamelessly lets himself go in sin with disregard, not of appearances, but of consequences. So the former contrasted clause will mean one who sins with some self-restraint, or "circumspectly," being anxious not about detection, but about losing control of himself and going altogether to the devil. He is "on the lookout" all the time that he indulges in sin because he well knows "Facilis descensus Averni," and he intends to keep the power of putting the brake on before too late. So the Lord's saying would naturally mean, "God's Rule does not come while [or because] you are on the lookout for it."

But no interpretation can be securely founded on the phrase alone. The connections of thought in the passage as a whole, and not in St. Luke only but in the Synoptic parallels, must be taken into account; and the

parallelism is here very intricate. Broadly speaking, Mark xiii., Matt. xxiv., and Luke xxi. are parallel; but Matt. x. 17-20, 30, and Luke xii. 7, 11-12, xvii. 31-2, 20-5, also come into the parallel. It is with the last passage, corresponding with Mark xiii. 21-3, Matt. xxiv. 23-8, that we are particularly concerned; and here Luke xvii. 20, 22, Matt. xxiv. 28 have no exact counterparts. Moreover, Luke xvii. 20-1 and 22-3 are very like doublets, though the careful distinction between the answer to Pharisees and the instruction of disciples requires that they should rather be considered complementary. But then the phrase "so shall the Son of man be in his day" (24) answers to "one of the days of the Son of man" (22), so that the figure of the lightning (24), and perhaps that of the carrion and the vultures (Matt. xxiv. 28) are connected with the instruction of the disciples. In that case the Pharisees' enquiry and the Lord's reply are left in striking isolation. Can we then appeal to Luke xvii. 22-5 (with Matt. xxiv. 28) for help in elucidating Luke xvii. 20-1 ? If not, our resources are seriously diminished; though this need not modify our interpretation, but only our confidence in its correctness. St. Luke, however, believed there was a close connection in thought, and may well have been right; so that it seems best to use all the resources we can.

The first result of doing so is to observe the various expressions for the single subject which are employed. In Matt. xxiv. 27 this is *ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, which corresponds with the fuller phrase introducing the whole section in v. 3, to which Mark xiii. 4 is similar, though with difference. In Luke there is no mention of *παρουσία* or *σημεῖον*, but *πότε* is prominent as in the parallels. This is followed by the three phrases *ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία, μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* [*ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ*], the last words resting on doubtful authority. Taken together these phrases can only have a futurist sense; and the one which has least claim to be original is certainly *ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία*, which has no support in the whole discourse in either Mark or Matthew, but only in Luke xxi. 21, where it is clearly a Lucan variation only. This entails the conclusion that the Pharisees' enquiry must be read as eschatological, and the Lord's answer concerns the revelation of Christ, whether to the world or to the disciples; which is indeed shown by the words "Lo here ! or there !" which the parallels give "Lo here is the Christ ! or There !"

What, then, did the Lord mean to say about his Presence or his Day when it shall come ? Let the two metaphors of the lightning and of the carrion and vultures be first considered. Both express the same idea of unmistakable presence suddenly realized, with no indication whence. Mysterious origin combined with undoubted experience of the fact is set forth in these figures. Travellers in the deserts of the East are often amazed to see a stricken beast fall to the ground and within a few minutes be surrounded by vultures, not one of which could be seen when it fell. Soaring vigilant at a height which makes it invisible, the bird overhead marks the creature fall, and drops at once to devour it, followed by others on the lookout aloft over a radius of many miles. So the vultures gather almost instantly, apparently from nowhere. Again, the night's darkness, made darker by heavy clouds, gives no prospect of light, and then suddenly all the welkin is illumined by the flash which lights up everything like day. One may be on the lookout for vultures in the desert, or for light during the night, and see nothing till the moment comes; but let the

carcase fall, or the thunderbolt, and there are the great birds, or the light, right before one unmistakably.

What is thus expressed in vivid metaphor is also put into terms: *οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως . . . ἰδοὺ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*, "not to those on the lookout . . . behold, within your reach." For *ἐντὸς* does not mean either "within you" or "among you." The word occurs here only in N.T. except for its substantival use in Matt. xxiii. 26, where *τὸ ἐντὸς* is in contrast with *τὸ ἐκτὸς*. Its idea is "within a limit," the context defining what the limit is. With arrows or javelins mentioned it means within range. *ἐντὸς πολλοῦ* is either within a great distance, or within a long time. With a relationship expressed it is within a degree of kindred. Used with a number of days or a fixed hour it means within the limit of time stated. *ἐντὸς ἐμαυτοῦ* is within my control; and *ἐντὸς ἑαυτοῦ γίγνεσθαι* to get possession of himself, the faculties being got under command. So there is a real antithesis between *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* and *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*; the contrast is between keeping a lookout and scanning the distant horizon, and being confronted with what lies under the eyes so near as to be within reach. What is put at length in Matt. xxiv. 26 as going out into the wilderness to see, and searching the inner chambers, is condensed in Luke xvii. 23 in *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*: on the other hand, the charge "believe it not" with which rumours are confuted in Mark and Matthew answers to *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* in Luke; for there is no room for credence or reports about what is said to be afar when it can be seen palpably within reach.

It seems, then, that consideration of all the relevant facts, whether of language or of the situation as a whole disclosed by the Synoptists, leads to a clear and consistent interpretation, though no single English word translates *παρατήρησις* satisfactorily. The effect might be obtained colloquially by saying ". . . is not coming for star-gazing"; but that is only paraphrase. The sense is, however, definite enough, and must be turned into English by some such rendering as "is not coming as you look about, . . . lo, it is within your reach."

E. P. Boys-Smith.

Hordle Vicarage.

(*b*) The Address of the Prayer in Ephesians iii. 14 *ff*.

Is there good reason to question the correctness of the *bisherige Erklärung* of Eph. iii. 15? An attempt is here made to show that there is.

1. *Evidence of O.T. Usage.*—In the O.T., to be "called by" some one's "name" means to be in a certain *relation* to him, usually that of son. So in Isaiah xliii. 7, "*Everyone that is called by my name*" is synonymous with "my sons and my daughters" in the preceding verse. In Gen. xlviii. 16, when Jacob says of Ephraim and Manasseh, "*let my name be named on them*, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac," he is claiming for them a place among the Twelve Tribes as *sons*. In Isaiah iv. 1, "let us be *called by thy name*" means "let us be given the legal standing of thy *wives*." In Zechariah xiii. 9, "They shall *call thy name upon them*" is equivalent to "shall confess, the Lord is *my* God, and shall hear him say, It is *my* people." In Isaiah lxiii., Jehovah is said at the Exodus to have begun "to make himself an everlasting name" (v. 12), to "make" himself "a name of glory" (v. 14), the import of which language is unfolded in the words, "Thou, O Lord, art our *Father;* our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name" (v. 16); and the sad cry: "We are become . . . as they that were not *called by thy name*"—*i.e.*,

who could not claim Thee as Father and Redeemer, of whom it was never said, "Israel is my son, my firstborn."

These passages shew that St. Paul must have been familiar with the expression of Israel's relation to Jehovah as his *son*, by the phrase "called by his name" or "having his name named on" it.

2. *Classical Usage:* (*a*) *General.*—Πατρόθεν ὀνομάζων is often used when addressing or referring to a man as *son* of his father, *e.g.*—

πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον (Homer, "Iliad," x. 68) where ἐκ γενεῆς is epexegetic of πατρόθεν.

In Thucydides vii. 69, we read how Nicias, just before the fatal fight off Syracuse, τῶν τριηράρχων ἕνα ἕκαστον ἀνεκάλει, πατρόθεν τε ἐπονομάζων, καὶ αὐτοὺς ὀνομαστὶ καὶ φυλήν, where the point of πατρόθεν ἐπονομάζων is shown by the added words ἀξιῶν . . . μὴ προδίδοναι τὰς πατρικὰς ἀρετὰς ὧν ἐπιφανεῖς ἦσαν οἱ πρόγονοι.

In the account of the battle of Philippi in Plutarch's "Life" of Brutus (49), we read:

"There too fell Marcus, the son of Cato . . . telling out who he was, and proclaiming himself Cato's son" (φράζων ὅστις εἴη καὶ πατρόθεν ὀνομάζων).

Ὀνομάζεσθαι is found with the simple genitive in the sense of receiving the title of *son*, as in the "Trachiniæ" of Sophocles (1105 *f.*):

ὁ τῆς ἀρίστης μητρὸς ὠνομασμένος,
ὁ τοῦ κατ' ἄστρα Ζηνὸς αὐδηθεὶς γόνος

("Of peerless mother nobly-titled son,
Offspring proclaimed of star-encircled Zeus");

and in the "Electra" of Euripides (934 *f.*):

κἀκείνους στυγῶ
τοὺς παῖδας, ὅστις τοῦ μὲν ἄρσενος πατρὸς
οὐκ ὠνόμασται, τῆς δὲ μητρὸς ἐν πόλει.

With these passages we may compare

ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ δὴ παῖδα μ' ὠνομάζετο
(Sophocles, "Œdipus Rex," 1021)

where the sense of "*claimed* as child," "called me *his* child," is further stressed by the use of the Middle Voice.

These passages, to which, of course, others might be added, go to show what range of ideas would be called up in the minds of St. Paul's readers by the words τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ ὀνομάζεται. They would assuredly think of *sonship*. It may not be going too far to say that they would think of the *conferring of sonship*. But this is to anticipate.

(*b*) *Legal.*—In Isæus (41) we meet with ὀνομάζειν used as a term of Attic Law in a way which helps us to grasp more firmly the thought that St. Paul's words convey. The words referred to are προδοῦναι τὸν πατέρα οὗ εἶναι ὠνομάσθην καὶ ὃς ἐποιήσατό με. The same legal process is spoken of in both clauses. "Whose name was conferred on me, and who adopted me as his son"—*i.e.*, "Whose son I was constituted by adoption."

We do not find ποιεῖσθαι in the N.T. used to express God's adoption of men as His sons. Nor does any Apostle addressing Christian men and women about their baptism use the words οὗ εἶναι ὠνομάσθητε. But

St. Paul told the Jews that Ananias said to him: *ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι . . . ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* (Acts xxii. 16), words which recall those of Gen. xlviii. 16: *καὶ ἐπικληθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου.* Would any Christian have failed to understand the words *τὸν πατέρα οὗ εἶναι ὠνομάσθης* of His baptism, as a member of Christ and child of God, when, like St. Paul, he "called the Lord's name upon himself"?

But if *ἐξ οὗ ὠνομάσθην* (or *οὗ εἶναι ὠνομασθην*), said by a Christian, tells of the sacred rite in which God made him His child, it is clear that *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὀνομάζονται* or *τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι ὀνομάζονται* can be said of men in either of two senses. The words *either* state generally the fact that men become Christians by "having God's name called on them" (or "calling" it "upon" themselves); *or* they say that certain men are at the moment going through this process.

The analogy of ii. 21 *f.*, coupled with the fact that St. Paul is gathering up in this prayer the truths laid down in the section of the Epistle of which those words are the close, points to the latter force of the present tense here. In other words, *ὀνομάζεται* refers to a process that is going forward, a process of admission to the status of sons of God.

Of whom does the Apostle speak as the subjects of this process? Are we to take *πᾶσα πατριά* to mean "every family," and to understand him to assert that heavenly and earthly families are one after another being admitted to divine Sonship? In spite of the baptism of whole households, we can hardly think that this is what he means. Nor would there be any obvious point in his going out of his way to use the word *πατριά* to convey a thought which would have been as well expressed by *οἶκος*. Can he, then, mean "the whole family"? This could hardly denote anything else than "all the sons of Adam," and would assuredly be an unusual and unlikely way of saying "the whole human race." Nor have we any ground for thinking that St. Paul would have described all mankind of past generations as "in heaven."

A solution of the problem is suggested by the use of *πᾶς*, which marks this and the companion letter, and, in a less degree, the First Epistle to Timothy. *Πᾶσα* is used repeatedly with abstract substantives, where we naturally understand it to mean *not* "of every kind" so much as "full," "complete," "consummate." *Πᾶσα σοφία καὶ φρόνησις* (i. 9), *πᾶσα ἀγαθωσύνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀλήθεια* ("*downright*" "*sheer*" goodness, v. 9) *πᾶσα ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ πραΰτης* (iv. 2) are cases in point. In iv. 16, *διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας* seems most naturally to mean "by virtue of *complete* contact with the supply"—*i.e.*, either "by *every part* of the organism being in touch with the supply," *or* "by the *entire wealth* of the supply reaching the organism." We are led by this use of *πᾶς* to believe that St. Paul, in his desire to express the universality of the Gospel, may have put such slight strain on language as was necessary to enable him to write (in ii. 21) *πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ* in the sense of "a *universal* building," and in iii. 15, *πᾶσα πατριά* in that of "a *universal* family." If he is speaking of the unceasing process by which men are being made *sons* of God, the fitness of the word *πατριά* to describe the Church of which they become members is obvious.

It is interesting to notice that Theodore of Mopsuestia sees that *ἐξ οὗ . . . ὀνομάζεται* refers, not to the bestowal or possession of an *appellation*, but to the inauguration or existence of a *relationship*. But, having in his text the words *τοῦ κυριόυ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* after *τὸν πατέρα*, he treats these words as the antecedent to *ἐξ οὗ*, and so understands the

relationship spoken of to be that between Christ and His saints, instead of that between the Father and His children. His words are—

προσπίπτω τῷ πατρὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν ἅπαν σύστημα εἴτε ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς οἰκεῖον καλεῖ τε καὶ ἡγεῖται δεσπότην (proprium vocat et æstimat dominum)..

Formerly, *one* people only could plead:

"Thou art *our Father*, though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us; Thou, O Lord, art *our Father*. . . . We are become as they that were not *called by thy name*. . . . But now, O Lord, thou art *our Father*" (Isa. lxiii. 16, 19; lxiv. 6).

But in Christ such a plea is open to *all*. This is the tenor of the great passage of which this prayer is the crown.

Νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ . . . δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (ii. 13 and 18).

The thought of ii. 11-22 is condensed into the address of the prayer *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ . . . ὀνομάζεται*, "Whose Name is being conferred on a universal family in heaven on earth," or "Into sonship to whom there is being brought," etc. Had St. Paul written *ὠνόμασται*, we should have rendered "Whose name is borne by," etc.

G. H. WHITAKER.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The International Review of Missions. Vol. xv., No. 59.

The excellence of this Special Double African Number deserves more than passing notice, so full is it of information; so wide are the subjects with which it deals; and so weighty is the authority of those who contribute to it.

We are introduced to French Colonial policy by Dr. Allégret. An important discussion of the South African problem follows, in which three points of view are represented. First, that of the South African man of affairs, contributed by Mr. X.; then that of a Professor in the Dutch Reformed Church, Dr. Du Plessis; and then that of an African Graduate of London University, Professor Tengo Jabavu. Valuable information is given on Health problems and Medical work; the Building of the Christian Church in Africa; Education; Literature; and Islam in Africa. Amid so much that is first-class we do not know how to select any for special mention, but perhaps the three papers which made the deepest impression upon us were those by Dr. Westermann, Father Callaway, and Dr. Bridgman. Dr. Westermann writes a powerful plea for the preservation of African civilization, created, as it has been, by the native soil, for Africa. He finds support in the article that follows from Dr. Fraser. Father Callaway's article is impossible to summarize; but it is extremely interesting, and we note that it is the central part of five short papers which are to be published in separate form. The great social work done by Dr. Bridgman is sufficient to guarantee the value of his illuminating account of Social Conditions in Johannesburg. He was engaged in its compilation up to within a few days of his death.

Altogether this African number is one that cannot be ignored. It is an important addition to literature on Africa. Our only regret is that space was not found for any article on Egypt. But we would strongly commend it to all readers of THEOLOGY, with perhaps a final remark that not the least valuable part of it is the space devoted to advertisements.

Nouvelle Revue Théologique. April, 1926.

This journal of the Jesuit professors at Louvain contains in the April number two very interesting articles on the late Cardinal Mercier, "Impressions and Souvenirs," by Father Vermeersch, and "Cardinal Mercier and the Study of Theology," by Father Charles. Father Vermeersch traces Cardinal Mercier's first appearance at Louvain to Pope Leo XIII.'s action in restoring St. Thomas to his place of honour in the universities which resulted in the transference of the Abbé Mercier from the "petit séminaire" of Malines, where he had been in charge of a philosophical class, to the new Chair of Scholastic Philosophy at Louvain. The new professor found, however, difficulties in his way, as his proposal to lecture on his subject in French was much objected to. These difficulties were cleared up as a result of direct representations to Rome, but Mercier's teaching was by no means acceptable to all. His school, however, won its way. As Archbishop, Mercier was much concerned with the sanctity and interior life of his clergy, but he had difficulties over the linguistic question. He hoped for a greater spiritual result from the experiences of the war than actually materialized, and was disappointed to see his dream of more faith and justice in the world vanish away. He had a great devotion to our Lady and tried to obtain a definition of a new title of honour, "Mary Universal Mediatrix of Grace." This definition was not obtained, though Benedict XV. seems to have been in favour of it personally, but a Mass of Mary Mediatrix was authorized, which was in fact said by his bedside on the day he died. Father Vermeersch notes that the late Cardinal disregarded criticism and censure in lending himself to the Malines "conversations" with members of the English Church.

Father Charles notes Cardinal Mercier's solicitude for the well-being of the secular clergy, a designation which (like Manning) he much disliked, his attempt to interest lay people in theology and the disappointment of Tyrrell and others who thought that he would be more complaisant to modernism than other prelates—but on that question English readers should remember Tyrrell's *Mediævalism.*

Nouvelle Revue Théologique. May, 1926.

The May number of this *Review* contains in the place of honour an article on Foreign Missions, apropos of the Papal Encyclical *Rerum Ecclesiæ* of February 28 last. This Encyclical, together with that of the late Pope on the same subject, is itself enough to refute the modernist contention that authority always acts as a "break," and never shows initiative. The present time is making the necessity of missionary effort felt everywhere, and the Anglican Church has had its "Missionary Convention" at Westminister, where a programme of work and needs has been drawn up in surprising detail, and great attention is being paid to the technical equipment of the men sent out—*e.g.*, the Kennedy School of Missions in America. The writer of the article, however, turns with relief from non-Roman Catholic projects, with their uncertain dogma, their hesitations and sentimentalisms, to the clear and precise Papal Encyclical. The Pope does not hesitate to demand the fostering of vocations to the mission field everywhere—there has never been a diocese which has injured itself by sending too many of its young men to mission work abroad. Old hesitations and reserves are to be swept away.

Indigenous clergy must be ordained; this was the method adopted in Europe among peoples that were far less cultured than the India or China of to-day. Such clergy, recruited from the native population, are not to be looked upon as inferiors, but should normally have the jurisdiction in their own hands: the European missionary should press on to other heathen. The aim is to be not merely the saving of individual souls, but the establishment of a permanent Church in each place. The religious life, both for men and women, must be organized as quickly as possible—congregations of contemplatives are found all over the East; what will they not be when converted to the True Religion and blessed and purified by Christ? Nor must effort be expended only on the humbler classes of the community; it is necessary to win for Christ the leaders in all walks of life. In that side of the work Catholic Universities at home can help. The Pope points the way to a great effort which it will, of course, take years to accomplish.

Nouvelle Revue Théologique.

The current number for July-August has an article by E. Hocedez, S.J., on the question: Is the mystery of the Incarnation specifically Christian? We are told that the idea first came to light in Egypt. The problem is more difficult to solve because the ideas of the ancient Egyptians on the subject of Man, and the Gods, are vague, and their mentality remains an enigma. Having discussed anticipations of the idea in the Græco-Roman religion and Hinduism and Buddhism, the writer quotes from M. Söderblom the words, "The idea of a unique incarnation is peculiar to Christianity; in all the other religions the incarnations are multiplied." In Catholicism the idea is allied with strict Monasticism without any mixture of unworthy ideas on divinity or philosophical errors. There is an interesting account of Mgr. Korum, the late Bishop of Trèves, and a useful note on the Magi based on a recent book by Dr. A. Bludam, Bishop of Ermland, "*The first* opponents of the Johannine writings." Among Acts of the Holy See is an Encyclical Letter on St. Francis of Assisi, with a survey of his teaching and an appeal to the Bishops to propagate the Third Order.

Ephemerides Théologicæ Lovanienses.

The July number has a stimulating article by L. Delporte on the principles of Biblical typology and the figurative elements of the Sacrifice of Expiation (Lev. xvi.). The reviews include one on the *Life of Richard de Middleton*, by E. Hocedez, S.J. Middleton was an English Franciscan who was probably educated at Oxford and sent to Paris at the time of the reaction of the old Augustinianism against Thomism. Another deals with the *Life of Gabriel Deshayes*, by Mgr. Laville and the Abbé C. Collin, a fascinating story of a Breton deacon who, when the Revolution broke out, went to seek ordination in Germany, and came back to St. Malo, where he ministered with apostolic zeal during the years of the Terror. In 1805, as Curé at Auray, he began building up schools for boys and girls and deaf mutes, and a seminary, and became the founder of a series of institutions, such as the Institute of the Sisters of Christian Instruction of St. Gildas. There is the usual wide survey of recent literature.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the current number M. G. Bardy considers at length the apologetic discourse of St. Lucian of Antioch. Eusebius refers to this discourse, but he does not give its text. The saint's Life is equally aware of it. The author reprints Rufinus's Latin version, and his notes add considerably to the value of his reprint. M. J. Viteau considers the institution of deacons and their wives, examining with the utmost care the relevant passages in the Acts. We give some of his conclusions. There is nothing in the New Testament to show that a deacon even once served at Holy Communion. The Jewish woman stood aside from religious observances. The law of Moses and the Rabbinical law had nothing to satisfy her desire after religion. Christianity had, on the other hand, broken completely with the unworthy routine of Judaism observed in the days before Christ, turning her position completely round, and assuring her henceforward a place equal to that of man in the new kingdom of God. M. R. Draguet critically considers Harnack's edition of *Marcion.* There is a powerful study of the thought of Marcion, who is depicted as a penetrating mind which admitted nothing but the reason of the implacable logician. While playing a warm tribute to the editorial labours of Harnack, yet M. Draguet thinks he perceives in it the spirit of Protestantism in the dry body of a second-century thinker. M. C. Balic turns to the manuscripts of the fourteenth century in order to ascertain facts bearing on the life, the doctrinal attitude, and the writings of Duns Scotus. As there is no contemporary biography of this thinker, the author turns to the manuscript in the library of Christ Church, Canterbury. One of M. Balic's conclusions is that Duns Scotus composed a commentary on part of the third book of the *Sentences,* and also a complete commentary on this part. The reviews attain their usual high standard of merit, and perhaps we may draw attention to those of Dr. Streeter's *The Four Gospels,* Mr. Driver and Mr. Hodgson's *Bazaar of Heracleides,* and the third volume of *The Cambridge Mediæval History.* Every scholar feels indebted to the editors of this invaluable review for the list of articles appearing in the different learned European periodicals.

The (American) Journal of Religion. July, 1926.

Professor William Adams Brown's article on " A Century of Theological Education and After " opens with some irritating generalities and a somewhat superficial review of the development of theological education in America; but the article becomes of extreme importance to those Englishmen interested in " American " Christianity when it comes to deal with present influences at work in theological education. Physical science, historical criticism, sociology, and the new psychology, have, according to the author, broken up the unity that lay behind the theological education of a century ago. Other circumstances (not least the increased immigration from Catholic Southern Europe) have helped to increase the tendency to secularization in education so that " Whether we look at the school, the college, or the university, we find a progressive secularization of education, which is all the more dangerous because of the increasing preoccupation of educational theory with practical interests." But the secularization of education, and the undermining of the old fundamentals of Protestantism, are, in the opinion of Professor Brown, to some extent compensated for by four great movements; first the social gospel which " is the attempt to restate the ideal of Christian missions in terms large

enough to include all the relationships of the Christian life"; secondly, there is the movement towards reunion; thirdly, that for religious education; finally, there is the fundamentalist movement. The writer justifies this evaluation of fundamentalism on these grounds: "We need to recover again the note of authority in the older religion—the sense of a 'needs must' that dominated the entire personality, and made the preaching of the Gospel an inward necessity that could brook no denial. In reminding us of this neglected phase of our religion, the fundamentalists are rendering a needful service." The article concludes with a disappointingly vague appeal to fit ourselves "to co-operate with our fellow Christians of other churches and of other lands in that co-operative study through which alone the church of Christ can be put in a position to fulfil its ecumenical function as the teacher of the nations." Those who have experienced theological education on both sides of the Atlantic will note one omission from Professor Brown's survey. Admittedly the best American theological seminaries are splendidly equipped on the technical side; the student has opportunities for supervised practical work that are unknown in England; in all the technical side of his profession, in opportunities for study and for acquainting himself with the very latest work in theology, in psychology, and in education, the American minister is at an advantage over the English ordinand; but English theological colleges, for their part, have not forgotten that the prerequisite for the theological education of the minister is a life of discipline, prayer, and interior devotion. Paradoxically, theological education in America owes its vagueness to its insistence on practical results and its neglect of the contemplative.

Bilychnis (Rome, July, 1926) has an article upon Mexico which puts the problem in a new light (*Il Messico e la sua costituzione laica*, by G. Pioli). The intense nationalism of the new Mexico is based upon memories of the Aztec civilization so cruelly suppressed by the Spanish conquerors. The vast majority of the population is of pure or predominantly Indian blood, and the Spanish aristocracy, which has hitherto furnished the landlords of the vast *latifundia*, as well as the higher clergy, has to contend with the awakened sense of historic wrong. Mexico is hardly a Catholic country, in the European sense. The Archbishop of Michoacan recently declared that not more than 20 per cent. of the baptized were practising Christians. The writer relies largely on the letters of Charlotte, the Belgian consort of the unfortunate Maximilian, who was horrified by the state of religion in Mexico. The fall of Maximilian was followed by a period in which Positivist and rationalistic influences prevailed in Government circles, but the Church, led by Spanish ecclesiastics, gradually increased its power. The revolutions which followed the fall of Porfirio Diaz' regime brought in a new state of things. The dominant philosophy among the Intellectuals is now Italian Idealism. Typical is the enlistment of 1,500 unpaid young men who have gone to teach illiterate Indians, under the banner of "Reparation and Expiation" for ancient wrongs suffered by the indigenous race. In 1917 the new Constitution was passed, setting up the lay State. The clauses affecting the clergy have been allowed to become a dead letter. The present trouble arises from the enforcement of the law. The Church by resisting it is in effect demanding an alteration of the Constitution.

In this long article, written from a Protestant standpoint, Russia and Bolshevism are not mentioned. This is refreshing. But the clauses of the Constitution, which are reproduced, are sufficient to outweigh any amount of eloquent pleading on the other side.

REVIEWS

CATHOLICISME ET PAPAUTÉ. Par Mgr. Pierre Batiffol. Paris: Lecoffre. 1925.

This little brochure consists of five papers, dealing with "les difficultés anglicanes et russes." The two most interesting to us are the first, in criticism of Dr. Gore's addresses in Grosvenor Chapel on *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism* (Mowbray, 1923); and the last, a rejoinder to an article on "Papal Rome and the Orthodox East," contributed by the Bishop to the *Christian East* of June, 1924, which was itself a reply to the first paper here printed. The two writers are friends. They understand each other thoroughly. Each represents a large body of opinion in his own communion. Both are looked up to as scholars of the highest distinction.

By the circumstances of its origin, *Catholicisme et papauté* wears the look of controversy. But behind it there is a conciliatory purpose; and by a positive view of the data pertinent to the discussion which are mainly derived from the history of the first five centuries Mgr. Batiffol makes some shrewd hits; but his urbanity is on a par with his skill, and he writes for reconciliation and not for victory.

It is worth while to note, first, some generous advances on his part.

The subject of infallibility, he observes, is not the Pope alone, but the episcopate in union with him. "Il est, en effet, de théologie élémentaire que l'inèrrance de l'Église étant posée en principe préalable, le sujet de cette infaillibilité n'est pas le pape seul, mais est constitué aussi bien, soit par les évêques dispersés à travers le monde, soit par les évêques reunis en concile œcumenique" (p. 25). The former mode of ascertaining the inerrant judgment of the Church was, as is well known, followed by the Imperial Government in 458 and supported by Pope Leo I., when he secured the final acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon (see my *History*, iii. 404 *sq.*); by Pope Hormisdas, when he effected the termination of the Acacian Schism (Duchesne, *L'Église du VI^me^ siècle*, 49 *sqq.*) in 519; and by Benedict XV., when he obtained the approval of the revised Canon Law. It is a method as valid for eliciting the mind of the episcopate, as that of assembling them in Council. And Mgr. Batiffol goes on to express his regret that, provoked by the attitude of the Councils of Constance and Bâle, or, again, of the French clergy in 1682, "les théologiens romains ont insisté presque unilateralement sur l'infaillibilité du pape" (p. 25). This is only to give instances in support of an illustra-

tion which I suggested in the pages of this review (November, 1924), and which Mgr. Batiffol does me the honour of accepting (p. 12), that the episcopate and the Pope are related to each other as a college to its head—neither can move without the other. Acceptance of this relation clears a good deal of ground, when it is remembered that the complexity of the facts on either side in the long movements of history is so great that a writer, if he is not careful, may lay stress exclusively on those which suit him.

But, further, speaking of the relations between Rome and the East in the fourth and fifth centuries, Mgr. Batiffol observes: "Les théologiens de chez nous supposent dans ces relations une constance organisée qui ne répond pas à la complexité concrète et mouvante des faits" (p. 38). A second and noteworthy admission which we cordially appreciate.

He illustrates it by a third. There were many churches which Rome treated as *sui iuris:* Africa, before the Vandal invasions; Egypt, where, in the times of Athanasius and Cyril, Rome never attempted "à intervenir dans le gouvernement ecclésiastique intérieur"; and the Church of Persia, under the Catholicos of the East (pp. 45 *sq.*). We might add that the same policy has distinguished the action of great Popes like Benedict XIV., in *Allatæ sunt* of July 26, 1755, or Leo XIII. in *Orientalium dignitas* of November 30, 1894, in their treatment of Uniats; who, so long as they accept the fundamentals of Faith and Order, have been confirmed in the use of their traditional rites and customs, and have never been subjected to the Roman Canon Law. What is to prevent an Anglican Uniat Church on these lines? Except, perhaps, that our rite is not the old one; and that, if we began to treat on these lines, some of our people might remind us of the fable of the spider and the fly.

But neither generous advances nor the necessarily controversial aspect of a book devoted to the criticism of other people's statements, exhaust the value of what Mgr. Batiffol has to say. He presents us with a positive reading of the history which, in the present efforts after reunion, is of first importance; and, as I believe, on the whole, true. It is set forth at length in his five volumes on *Le Catholicisme, des Origines à St Leon*, but summarized here. Starting with the authority of the Roman Church in the time of Pope Victor, 189–†98, as then reaching from Gaul to Mesopotamia and everywhere accepted (pp. 33 *sq.*), this primacy, or leadership, belonging to the Roman See, was obscured in the fourth century by the dominance, in Church affairs as in others, of the imperial power under Constantine and Constantius. The former toward the end of his reign, and the latter throughout it, favoured the Arians; and Cæsaropapism

became the real danger. The reaction appeared, in Western Catholicism, under Pope Julius I., 337–†52; when the Roman See set out to recover unity and to reinforce it by a fresh emphasis on its own primacy—both unity and primacy being inherent and original in Catholicism from the first. With the overthrow of Arianism by the State under Theodosius I. there followed an upward movement—"une courbe ascendante" (p. 38)—in the growth of the papal power between 381 and 451; which issued in that union between Pope and Council at Chalcedon when the Council accepted the authority of the Roman See, as *jure divino* (p. 112), in co-operation with its own. With occasional misunderstandings between East and West, the co-operation of Pope and episcopate went on till 1054, when the Orient went back, under the leadership of Michael Cærularius, upon what it had accepted six hundred years before (p. 42).

Thus, while making room for the rights of other Patriarchates in the East—as, again, at the Council of Florence,* 1439—and in the West of Churches enjoying traditional rights of their own, the Roman See had from the first a *sollicitudo* over the whole, with a right of supervision and a right of intervention (p. 46). If, in the exercise of these rights and duties, the Roman See has been too strict, allowance must be made for her isolation: "Il a eu à se defendre seul contre les schismes, seul contre le protestantisme, seul contre le modernisme. Il y a pris une attitude de défensive, de concentration, de rigueur, qui son isolement lui imposait" (p. 50). But strict as she has had to be for these reasons, and, we might add, in consequence of the opposition she herself provoked in the sixteenth century by what Dr. William Barry has called "a worldliness which has never been surpassed" (*Cambridge Modern History*, i. 621)—there can be no reunion but by a miracle, "qui ne s'accomplira pas sans l'Eglise romaine et en dehors d'elle" (p. 51).

It is worthy of note that both Dr. Gore and Mgr. Batiffol agree in regarding the Papacy as "providential." The Papacy cannot, therefore, be bowed out unceremoniously as it used to be (p. 96), and so the old controversies are out of date. But can we go further and admit the Papacy to be *jure divino?* Yes, if by that we mean that the evidence of history is evidence of the divine will behind it—*i.e.*, that, in the constitution of the Church, the Papacy has a *jus divinum* analogous to the *jus divinum* of the episcopate. I do not think that Mgr. Batiffol would press us to acknowledge a *jus divinum* for the Papacy—that is, something dogmatic and credal to be read into the

* "Renovantes insuper ordinem traditum in canonibus cæterorum venerabilium patriarcharum . . . salvis videlicet omnibus privilegiis et iuribus eorum." Eugenius IV. in *Lætentur cœli*, § 9 (C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, 4, No. 400).

history of the Church, rather than something that arises naturally out of it. This would be a conception more Occidental than Catholic; and we note that M. Glubokovsky, while making a distinction between "la papauté historique" and "la papauté dogmatisée" agrees with us in saying "J'accepte la papauté historique: nous orthodoxes sommes prêts à revenir à elle" (p. 7). The position could scarcely be better put than in a "Note on the Holy Roman Church" in *Essays Catholic and Critical*. "The rejection of the autocratic claims [*sc.* of the Papacy] need not involve the rejection of the view that the Papacy has a special function to fulfil in the life of the Church. Further, just as the authority of the episcopate is held to be *de jure divino* on the ground that by a process of legitimate development the episcopate has become the repository of the authority given to the Apostles, so it might be held that the Papacy possesses an authority *de jure divino* as having become, by a similar process, the repository of a primacy held by St. Peter. Anglican theologians can, and should, be prepared to discuss this possibility with an open mind. But while doing so, they cannot concede the actual claims made or presupposed by the majority of Roman theologians in regard to the position and authority of the Papacy" (*Essays*, etc., p. 118).

B. J. KIDD.

THE ENGLISH MICROCOSM.*

THERE are two ways of approaching the problem of Christian reunion. The explorer may either start from the original unit, trace the rise and development of divisions, and so arrive at the present state of confusion, with some knowledge of its causes rooted in history and of reconciliations effected in the past; or, on the other hand, he may begin with a survey of the present, measure the differences which keep men asunder, and study the possibilities of accommodation. In the former method there is a risk of undue insistence on things that are irreparably past, of reading into present controversies forgotten issues, and of missing new causes of disunion which are now operative. To approach the subject in the latter way is to incur the danger of treating separation as fundamental, and the Christian Church as atomic in structure; union will then be sought by the process of linking together diversities, and federation rather than organic unity will be the end proposed. Either method is legitimate, but each needs correction by some application of the other.

* *The Confusion of the Churches: a Survey of the Problem of Reunion.* By the Rev. Kenneth D. Mackenzie, M.A. Philip Allan and Co. 10s. 6d. net.

It is perhaps unfair to suggest that Mr. Kenneth Mackenzie has given himself up to the latter method. Certainly his book contains much history, but both his title and his survey of present circumstances indicate an acceptance of existing disunion as a basis on which to build. Here he has a firm hold on realities; in history, on the other hand, he frequently stumbles. I am not disposed to dog his footsteps there, for what he has to say about the present is far more interesting and incomparably more useful.

To build on the existing state of Christendom is indeed inevitable. To think of recalling anything out of the past is mere idle dreaming. The past has passed away; that is the first thing to be grasped by anyone who would essay construction. But the present is the work of the past, and cannot be entirely understood without reference to origins. There have been also in the past conditions resembling those in which we live, and the treatment which those conditions received is instructive, not only in the way of warning. We may never be able to repeat the successful treatment of troubles, however like our own; but success in the past forbids despair of the present. Its frequent lesson is that we must not let ourselves be hampered by theory or tied down too straitly to tradition. We must look for new inspiration; the way of safety is very often *quod minime reris*.

But we are not to build on the existing state of Christendom as if this provided our only materials; still less as if we took this for the foundation. It is necessary to seek a real unity underlying the obvious disunion. If there is no such unity, we shall be driven to the conclusion either that no true Church of Christ actually exists, or that one of the groups of nominal Christians superficially apparent is that true Church, all the rest being excluded. The latter alternative is notoriously accepted by the more intransigent supporters of the Papacy, and by some equally intransigent theologians among the Eastern Orthodox. The former alternative is perhaps nowhere definitely adopted by any professed Christians, but there are under-currents of opinion based on some such conclusion; it is said that there was once a single united Church, but it has been broken into fragments, or survives at most in an unorganized multitude of true believers; a movement towards Christian unity can take the form only of federation; a united Church—the phrase is current—must be a new structure composed of groups hitherto entirely independent; two or more groups may coalesce in this way, and the ultimate aim is a federal union of all groups.

One sentence in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 has been rather perversely interpreted as committing its authors to this desperate

opinion. They define the Catholic Church as "an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the kingdom of God." They then confess: "This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day." On the contrary, "we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest." What is this, it has been asked, but a denial of the existence of any Christian unity, of any one Church? But the inference is contrary to the whole purport of the Appeal, and in particular to the recognition of "membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body," as visibly sealed by Baptism. The mistake is due to the distinction apparently drawn between "Universal" and "Catholic," which again is due to the use of the latter word in its secondary or intensive sense. In this sense Catholicity stands in the possession of those qualities which make the Christian religion ideally and potentially universal. What the authors of the Appeal sorrowfully confess is that nowhere in the world can there be identified one visibly united organization comprising all who are possessed of those qualities. Such an organization would be intensively "the Catholic Church," even though the Body of Christ be wider.

If such there were, the problem of Christian reunion would be simplified. The one thing necessary, the one thing possible, would be the gathering of all the children of God that are scattered abroad into that organization. Here we catch sight of one of the perils besetting the historical treatment of the subject. For that is precisely how we read the relation of the Great Church at various epochs to sporadic heresies. It is doubtful whether we always read it accurately, and in any case we shall go wrong if we apply our reading crudely to the circumstances of to-day. For to-day there is nothing answering exactly to that Great Church of fact or of imagination. Numbers alone—and numerical values are not unimportant—are sufficient to prove it. No organized group now contains more than a minority of Christians. Only those who believe that submission to the Roman Pontiff is the one determining mark of Catholicity can complacently summon all others to "come in hither," and their call is little heeded; the confident judgment of the *orbis terrarum* is against them.

We are thus thrown back on a number of groups, in which we must find some natural or supernatural element of unity if our aim is to be anything more than universal federation of separate Christian Churches. We say that we believe in one Church;

we must not pretend that we can make one out of many. It is here that Mr. Mackenzie's book does not altogether satisfy me. My own bent is so much towards the historical treatment of the subject that I look jealously at his transition from the past to the present in search of the necessary continuity, and there seems to be a certain weakness in the juncture. His treatment of "the centrifugal period," though well managed, appears to land him in an entirely new state of things, where some sections of Christendom have links with the past, but others have not; and it puzzles me to find him calling the Vatican Council the "climax" of that period. Does he mean that the Council determined the segregation of the Papal Communion from the rest of Christendom? That is to exaggerate the change which it effected. Does he mean that it put a stop to hopes of reunion and to endeavours based on those hopes? It did this for a time, but there has been a recovery from that depression. The new definition has been found to mean less than either its promoters or its opponents read into it. In the rest of Christendom he seems to lose sight of development, and to recognize a term reached in which conditions are fixed. I should wish to insist that Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Methodism are as truly developments of primitive and medieval Christianity as modern Catholicism—aberrant developments, indeed, but growths which can be accounted for, and which have not ceased from growing. They are integral parts of Christendom—deformed parts, but not amputated limbs. Mr. Mackenzie is inclined to regard them rather as existing side by side with the historic Church than as offshoots from it. What is the significance of his title-page? His survey of history takes accurate note of much confusion found at various times within the Church; then he passes on to the confusion of the Churches. What are these Churches? He seems to speak of them in that sense which is a denial of the fundamental unity of the Body of Christ.

It is perfectly true that any organized group of Christians may be called a Church. That use of the word appears already in the Apostolic writings. But groups were so called, and have always been so called until recent times, precisely because they consist of persons who are presumed to be very members of the one Church of God which is the Body of Christ. The group may be regarded as a complex member of the organic whole. But a man is not a member of the Church because of his inclusion in the group. On the contrary, it is because he and his companions are members of the Church at large that the group in which they are included can properly be called a Church. Thus the Church does not consist of groups more or less intimately connected; it consists of individual members, who are for the

purpose of intimate religious fellowship gathered in groups. Those groups may be ill-conducted; they may quarrel with one another; they may fall out of regular communion with one another. Then they are a cause of confusion within the Church, and those which are less guilty—or, if that be possible, not guilty at all—suffer almost as much as the most guilty; for none of them lives to itself or dies to itself.

The history of Christendom is full of these confusions, unseemly wranglings, mutual excommunications, fierce persecutions. It is well to remember this, lest we think our own troubles altogether exceptional. It is well to keep these things in perspective; for then, as we read the sorrowful history, we become aware of a real unity continuing through the disorder, asserting itself from time to time in peace-making beyond expectation, and we call this the working of the one Spirit in the one Body of Christ. Such is the historic approach by which we come in hope to the study of our present divisions. But the method, as I have said, has snares for us. We study the ways in which divisions have been healed; they are various, but we make a synthesis of them and arrive unconsciously at the judgment that just so, and not otherwise, are the wounds of the Body of Christ to be closed or mollified with ointment. This or that can properly be done; this or that would be an improper course of action. Mr. Mackenzie, breaking away from the historic method, lights upon a golden saying applicable here: "In the abnormal state of Christendom we cannot always press the proprieties of Catholic life into the very highest notch." Addicted as I am to the historical method, and valuing as I do those proprieties which it establishes, I can gladly accept this, subject to the observation that the state of Christendom has always been abnormal, and will not become normal until men cease from sinning. That, however, is no reason for abstaining from strenuous, and even perilous, attempts to find a new remedy for enormous evils. Mr. Mackenzie is daring in this attempt.

Like others in the course of the last hundred years, he thinks that special facilities for this work may be found in the Church of England, which is, he says in another illuminating phrase, "the nearest thing there is to a microcosm of the Christian world, and displays to that world the extraordinary spectacle of what is possible in the way of unity between men whose beliefs and temperaments are as different as ours." He is speaking of the Church of England as narrowly understood, where in one communion are held together Catholicism and other elements which I would rather not call Protestant—though Mr. Oliver Quick in a recent work has done so very persuasively—since a less negative term may be preferred; question-begging as the

description is, I would call them Evangelical. Mr. Mackenzie's meaning is that in this one communion are found most of the diversities which make the present "confusion of the Churches." Is not that an object lesson showing what may be done more widely? Here is an example of unity, and he pleads: "It is not a unity to be lightly shattered."

I would ask leave of him to enlarge the lesson by making the object wider, and taking the Church of England in its widest sense of the whole multitude of Christians living together in England. Here is a more complete microcosm of the Christian world. Here are, as Mr. Mackenzie points out, two kinds of Catholicism, which we may conveniently call Episcopal and Papal. For Mr. Mackenzie loyally insists that it is unreasonable to question the catholicity of those "Popish Recusants" whose particularity consisted only in adherence to the religious beliefs and practices of their fathers; as he puts it, English Catholicism "bifurcated" in the sixteenth century. Side by side with these are found almost all the varieties of religion which have sprung from the shattering cataclysm of the Reformation. Nor is that all. There are also congregations of the Eastern Orthodox, not visitors only, but denizens, under the care of a Bishop whose relations with the English hierarchy serve to illustrate Mr. Mackenzie's scheme of hope. It is indeed a microcosm. And in that happy word Mr. Mackenzie, it seems to me, has inadvertently stumbled upon the very thing which his argument otherwise lacks. For a microcosm implies a Cosmos, and cosmos means unity. Let us boldly aver that English Christianity, the Church of England in the largest sense, is a real unit. I think it cannot be denied; there are actions, few but significant, which make it indisputable; there are times when, with negligible exceptions, we all pull together, and do so for no other reason but that we are Christians. At other times, and more frequent times, some of us pull hard against each other, and make rents in the unit which we are. Hence the confusion, which is confusion within this Church of England. The unit remains.

Mr. Mackenzie adumbrates a scheme for resolving the confusion, not only in this microcosm, but in the whole cosmos of the Christian Church. I do not like his scheme. It violates too many of those dear proprieties. But that is no reason for banning it, unless I can produce one more workable; and I cannot. He appears to contemplate the continuance of all the existing "Churches," brought into communion with each other. That implies the provision of supposed essentials which some of them may lack. Mr. Mackenzie certainly includes among these an adequate hierarchy, but not necessarily a hierarchy identical

in form with any that has been hitherto in function. He contemplates with tolerant cheerfulness a sectional Church in which there will be no baptism of infants. That is certainly a breach of the proprieties; but one has to remember a corresponding practice of the fourth century, widespread among unimpeachable Catholics. Let this pass for an eccentricity. That question of novel hierarchies may be more serious. Yet I reflect that the cherished propriety of a uniform episcopate, the rule of one Bishop for one place, has already broken down in practice, notably among the Uniat Churches under the Papacy; and it is perhaps unnecessary to be more conservative than Rome. That Orthodox Bishop in England provides the same lesson; there are other ways of relating pastor and flock than by domicile. Difficulties of the external kind fade when closely examined. Others may be less superable, but what of that? Blazing a track to Christian reunion is a great adventure. Let us be venturesome.

T. A. Lacey.

NOTICES

Ignatian Retreats. By W. H. Longridge, S.S.J.E. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

The writer of this review met not long ago a well-known missioner of the Society of Jesus who said he was starting at once on a tour in North America to give many missions and retreats. He was taking with him, by way of help for his work, no book except Fr. Longridge's edition of the *Exercises*, which he had found to be an excellent storehouse of the most authentic instruction on the subject.

Retirement for contemplation, consideration, and prayer is a practice belonging to nearly all religion, but St. Ignatius gave a special direction and point and character to such periods of retirement when, in the sixteenth century, he threw himself into the apostolate of the counter-Reformation. For him a retreat meant a very skilfully arranged and very delicately balanced process of appeal to the mind and the heart—to the intellect, the will, and the emotions—which was designed to result in the consecration of the whole being of the retreatant to God. Every conductor should be able to give retreats very closely modelled on St. Ignatius' plan, with very full use of much of the exact text of the *Exercises*. But there are two difficulties. The complete plan of St. Ignatius cannot be followed in less than a month; and an average retreatant is apt to find his annual retreat of three days rather monotonous, if each year he is expected to make his meditations on the central points of the *Exercises*, given to him in very similar words. The need, therefore, is that the conductor shall be able to use the leading ideas, the underlying framework, of St. Ignatius' plan with varying settings.

Students of Mgr. d'Hulst's retreats will remember how cleverly and impressively he arranged his discourses; the argument of the *Exercises* is never far away, yet the illustrations and the arrangements are continually new.

In his new book Fr. Longridge has provided excellent matter both for

conductors of retreats and for those who make their retreat alone, with no priest to suggest the meditations. Saturated as he is with the "spirituality" of St. Ignatius, and the large literature which has gathered round the *Exercises*, he provides matter for the meditations of three retreats of four or six days, combining very well faithfulness to the plan of St. Ignatius with freshness of setting.

Fr. Longridge's three retreats are printed together in one volume; each retreat is also printed separately; and the meditations are also to be had, each on a separate sheet.

J. P. Briscoe.

Thorns. By E. A. Bryans. Longmans. 2s. 6d., paper cover; 3s. 6d., cloth.

This charming little book is a contribution towards the solution of the problem of human suffering, more especially what we regard as "undeserved" suffering. Its motto is a sentence from St. Thérèse of Lisieux, "I will always sing, even if I must pluck my roses from the midst of thorns." It is an intensely human document—a narrative told in letters, the characters being a brother and sister, the brother's friend, and his elder brother and sister. The effect of suffering on each of these is told with sympathetic understanding as well as literary skill. A long introduction by Fr. Vernon is not the least valuable part of the book. The leading thought is that sorrow and suffering are not only for the purifying of the sufferer's soul, but also, and perhaps primarily, in order that thereby others may be blessed. This is of course supremely true of our Lord's sufferings. But His followers can "continue His work of redemption by being nailed to His cross." A beautiful book, written, we may be certain, by one whose own sufferings are bearing fruit unto life eternal.

H. W. Fulford.

BOOK NOTES

To present a bird's-eye view of the Stockholm Conference of 1925 was no easy task, but Mr. Edward Shillito has accomplished it in a readable and stimulating volume published by Messrs. Longmans under the title *Life and Work* (4s. net, cloth). His book is an attempt to do for Stockholm what the author's *Christian Citizenship* did for Copec, and it challenges attention from all those who are seeking to apply the Christian Faith to the social and economic problems of modern life.

Social Discipline in the Christian Community, edited by Mr. Malcolm Spencer (Longmans, 2s. 6d. net, paper covers), is an attempt by a group of writers to formulate the question of Christian guidance for social life in the light of its history. There are chapters on Discipline and Direction in the Early Church, in the Middle Ages, in the Post-Reformation period in non-Episcopal churches, and in the English and Roman branches of the Catholic Church. The editor attempts to indicate the lessons of history and the way forward.

Two books issued by the Faith Press (2s. 6d. net each) are opportune in the light of an increasing attention now being paid by Catholics to the formulation of a philosophy of the Christian Religion. The one by W. R. V. Brade deals with the later phases of the tradition of Greek Philosophy under the title *From Plotinus to St. Thomas Aquinas*; the other is by

Dr. Hans Driesch, who delivered a course of four lectures before the University of London at King's College in March, 1924, and now prints them for the benefit of a wider audience under the title *The Possibility of Metaphysics*. Some four years ago the Sacred Metropolis of Thyateira was established for the purpose of supervising the religious needs of the Greek Orthodox communities of Northern and Western Europe. A manual of Instruction on Faith, Morals, and Worship is now issued for English-speaking Greeks. It is an excellent piece of work by the skilled pen of the Rev. C. Callinicos, Protopresbyter of the Greek community in Manchester, and may be heartily commended to all those English Catholics who are seeking sound information as to the doctrine and practice of the Orthodox Church. The title of the book is *The Greek Orthodox Catechism* (price 2s. 6d., published under the auspices of the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Thyateira at 20, Newton Road, Bayswater, W. 2.). H. M. R.

A Handbook to the Drink Problem. By Will Reason. S.C.M. 1s. 6d. Seventy questions are put and answered in this most sane and useful book, which will appeal to those who cannot accept the ordinary propaganda put out by the Temperance Party. Among Churchpeople there is less enthusiasm for " Temperance " than of old, mainly due to an impression that the problem is solving itself. This is true only to a limited extent, for the favourable figures of recent years are due mainly to the industrial depression. The remedy proposed is the late Bishop of Oxford's Bill, the essential features of which are (1) the local mandate; (2) the offering of three choices—no change, reorganization, no license; (3) compensation together with a time limit; (4) no return to private ownership. Reorganization means roughly the Carlisle plan. In that city 84 licenses were abolished, one brewery took the place of five, convictions for drunkenness fell from 958 in 1916 to 71 in 1924, and, thanks to elimination of unnecessary competition and of advertisements, the cost to the State has been nil; the whole capital value will accrue to the State, all obligations having been paid off, in a few years' time.

The Story of the English Prayer-book. By Dyson Hague, D.D. Longmans. 5s. Most Englishmen have learned to speak and write temperately about the Sixteenth Century and the Reformation. School text-books are much fairer than they were, and the economic preoccupations of the day have turned popular sympathies away from the new nobility in the direction of the dispossessed monks. No such movements of thought have reached Canon Hague of Toronto. All the centuries previous to the Reformation are for him (and, so he imagines, for historians) the Dark Ages. The Reformation was simply light conquering darkness. John Wycliffe dealt the Pope " his first death-blow "—the last has been a long time coming ! The Prayer-book of 1552, as regards the points in which it differed from that of 1549, was the work of the Holy Spirit. It marked the triumph of liberty, and of the laity's rights. Without noticing the inconsistency, the author explains that two-thirds of the nation were opposed to the 1549 Book, as going too far in the Reforming direction, and that the 1552 Book had to be imposed by force.

We regard this book as a specimen of hagiography rather than of history. It is racily written, and calculated to interest every reader. The modern parts, dealing with Prayer-book Revision in the Anglican Communion, are almost entirely uncontroversial.

God and Evolution. By W. R. Matthews. Longmans. 3s. This tiny book—it contains less than 60 pages of large type—has a value quite disproportionate to its size. Dr. Matthews explains with rare lucidity the modern Religion of Evolution, of which Prof. S. Alexander is "the Aquinas," H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw the prophets, and Prof. Julian Huxley a distinguished exponent, and shows that it can never satisfy man's craving for One beyond Time. A God who is brought into being by the evolutionary process is not what Christians understand by God; practically these philosophers reduce Theism to a doctrine of the Logos only.

The Aim of Jesus Christ. By W. P. Cooley. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d. This book, by a Professor in Columbia University, New York, may be cordially recommended to those who want a clear and sincere statement of thorough-going Modernism. Jesus was merely the initiation of a movement which afterwards became Christianity. If he were to return to earth the Church would be as unintelligible to him as Buddhism is to the average Anglo-Saxon. His mistaken ideas affect his service to mankind but little. His adherents, wishing to bring in the kingdom, "must share Jesus' breadth of interest, his enthusiasm for humanity." The kingdom, apparently, for the writer is "the cause of humanity in this present world."

The whole position seems to us radically false. The Historic Jesus was dominated by the Transcendence of God, not by "enthusiasm for humanity." As this magazine exists largely to combat the author's views, it is sufficient to point to its pages generally for their refutation.

The New Testament of Jesus Christ. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. A recent addition to *The Orchard Books* is Dom Hudleston's reprint of the Rheims Version of 1582. The edition modernizes the spelling and punctuation, but otherwise follows the original faithfully. The literary value of this version is great, for it exercised a great influence on the Authorized Version. Many will find devotional helpfulness in reading the New Testament in a new guise.

The Joy of Salvation. By Walter Carey, D.D., Bishop of Bloemfontein. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. The Bishop gives us another of his delightful little books, ranging over many regions in the wide domain of Churchmanship. He declares that he is now 50 and as happy as ever. In these breezy, unconventional chapters he tries to reveal to the average layman something of that source of happiness which he himself has found. Needless to say, he succeeds in his attempt.

Trans-Caucasia. By Harold Buxton. Faith Press. 3s. Father Buxton's labours in the Near East for the Armenians are, or should be, known in all the churches. In the present volume he gives a description from recent first-hand observation of the three Caucasian Soviet Republics —Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. The misery caused by war and post-war conditions to the unfortunate inhabitants is clearly brought out. What is surprising and indeed gratifying—for we want the truth at whatever cost to our prejudices—is the testimony to the vigorous life of these communities under the Soviet régime. The supervision of Moscow has saved them from worse things. The Armenians have at last secured a national home under Russian protection. The information here given probably does not exist elsewhere in so succinct and trustworthy a form.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER